

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW.

NO. 2.—MARCH, 1897.

I.

THE RELATION OF THE REFORMED CHURCH TO
NEW THEOLOGY.*

BY JOHN C. BOWMAN, D. D.

It is unfortunate that the phrase "New Theology" has come to be used in popular usage in a somewhat narrow and restricted sense which falsifies its proper meaning. Apart from all prejudicial connections the terms, whether considered separately or jointly, are terms with which no fair-minded person should quarrel. Theology is a good word; equally good as new. Nor is there any cause for the debasement of either concept by their combination in New Theology.

In the name itself, therefore, in whatever light it may be regarded, there is no suggestion of evil. New year, new man, new covenant are kindred terms, and if new theology be allowed its rightful place in the same family group, it will be treated with like unprejudiced regard.

So much appears under the name of new theology at the present time that, in the discussion of the subject, it may be well at the outstart to guard oneself against possible misunderstanding and false imputation.

*That the writer may not be regarded as assuming to represent the attitude of his denomination toward new theology, it need simply be stated that the subject of this paper, as it stands, was (unofficially) assigned to him by others.

By new theology I do not mean the "New England hypothesis," the discussion of which caused for a time quite a ripple of excitement in theological circles. That hypothesis after all is simply an ancient belief revived in new form, and was never designed nor held by its staunchest advocates as a regulative principle of theological belief.

Nor do I understand by new theology a "German importation of rationalistic philosophy," which would evolve all religious thought and institutions out of simply natural and historical forces, and which would limit the Christian's creed to the two articles: I believe in God the Father, and in the Son Jesus Christ. Nor yet can new theology be adequately defined as a phase of modern religious thought. It is not the product of the modern age, as it is not of former ages. No age can produce a theology *de novo*. Scholastic theology was new as compared with the theology of the Fathers. Reformation theology was new as compared with Mediæval theology. The theology of our own time is new as compared with confessional orthodoxy. But no age may have the credit of imparting to theology the quality of newness. Much less may an individual or a group of individuals claim the honor of creating or inventing a new theology, although this distinction does seem to be accorded to certain teachers and preachers who profess to be the expounders, if not the discoverers of "Christocentric theology."

In apostolic times theology was new; it is new to-day. By new theology, therefore, I mean the newness of theology—an essential quality or principle of all true theological science. Being a science, theology must be progressive; it must renew itself from age to age. It can have no fixed, unvarying standard. Accordingly we speak of New Testament theology, Patristic theology, Mediæval theology and of Modern theology. By these terms we mean that the different periods of history were characterized by a distinctive system of theological belief. Distinctions are drawn still more sharply by assigning a standard to each century, as the theology of the sixteenth century, of the seventeenth, of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth century.

This variation of the theological standard from age to age is no discredit to theology as a science. As a progressive science it must grow and vary in accordance with the law of historical development. A review of the history of theology from apostolic times down to the present fully exhibits the continuous operation of this principle.

When, therefore, the term new theology is applied to the religious thought, or certain aspects of the thought of our age, it should not be implied that a new principle has been discovered, but rather that truth in its development has assumed new forms suited to changed conditions; and, further, that through the struggles and yearnings after more truth new contributions have been made to the fund of religious knowledge.

It must, however, be acknowledged that the changes, which in recent times have taken place in the various departments of theological science, are out of the usual order, and that the phrase "new theology" has special significance as representing the tendency or trend of the religious thought of the present age. The scientific spirit has attained to unprecedented ascendancy, and scientific methods are applied, as never before, to the study and attempted solution of the various problems of religious thought and life. If the characteristic of the religious thought of the age may be defined by one word, it is Criticism. The critical tendency has always, to greater or less degree, accompanied theological science, but only within the present century, and especially during the latter half, has it come to wield dominant influence. With the present century there was introduced a new era of intellectual activity. The spirit of inquiry and criticism invaded every department of learning. Especially in the domain of religious thought did this impulse to original investigation and independent judgment make itself felt.

The old standards of belief which served well the purpose for which they were designed, and which met largely the peculiar requirements of the several ages which produced them, could not satisfy the mind of the nineteenth century.

It is no disparagement of the wisdom of former ages to main-

tain that it could not formulate a system of religious thought so complete as to provide for the solution of the many new problems that would arise in succeeding ages.

Every age must do its own thinking, and out of its own resources must make provision for its peculiar needs. In the degree that the mind of an age seeks to satisfy itself by resting upon the intellectual and spiritual products of former ages, will its capacity for truth become impaired, and the inevitable result is intellectual and spiritual stagnation and decadence. That is what is meant by bondage to traditionalism, the enslavement of both mind and conscience, and the repression of Christian truth and life.

New theology describes a reactionary tendency in the religious thought of the nineteenth century, a changed attitude towards the standards of orthodox confessionalism. It is not an attitude of hostility toward the old standards of doctrinal belief. They are not ruthlessly set aside as possessing no value. They are duly appreciated for the service they rendered in their proper day as safeguards against error and as defenses of the faith. But the old doctrinal standards do not contain the truth in its wholeness, and cannot serve as adequate guides for the Church of all ages. Having served their day and purpose, they must give way to new and enlarged forms of statement, which the expanding life of truth requires for its fuller expression.

New theology, rightly understood, does not array itself against the old. Its mission is not to deny and to destroy. It embodies a positive and constructive principle which adapts old truths to new conditions, and applies new methods to the study of old problems, so that in the light of our day they may find a larger interpretation and truer solution. At the same time it opens up and presses along new lines of study and research, thereby enlarging the realm of Christian knowledge and making fresh and valuable contributions to theological science. I can make but passing reference in this connection to the astounding results of archaeological research, as the recent discovery of Assyrian tablets and monuments which add not less than two thousand years

to the chronology of human history, also to the notable development of Semitic philology which has given a new impetus to Biblical science. The benefits of these modern original investigations are of incalculable service to every one who would make earnest with the study of Biblical history and literature.

The age in which we live is one of profound transformation, intellectual and social, abounding in new needs, new questions and new points of view. Theology wisely adapts itself to the new order. Theology, that is to say, takes on a new development. That does not mean innovation, unorthodoxy, nor the renunciation of the truth wrought out in former ages. The real development of theology is a process in which the Church, standing firm in her old truths, enters into the possession of the new social and intellectual movements of each age, and, because the truth makes her free, is able to assimilate new material, to welcome all new knowledge, bringing forth out of her treasures things new and old. Thus does the Church show again and again her power of witnessing under changed conditions to the catholic capacity of her faith and life.*

The cry that the old orthodox doctrines are not preached as they once were, while it expresses groundless alarm, presents a statement of fact which it would be vain to deny. We do not think, we do not want to think precisely as our fathers thought, and we differ still more in the manner of expressing what we do think. This does not imply a depreciation of their wisdom or a lack of reverence for their memory. Theological fashions change as do all other fashions. Old truths are recast in new moulds. They are viewed from different angles of vision. But, notwithstanding the deviation from old lines, the truth itself is as firmly held and as highly prized as by former generations.

Moreover, it may be claimed, in the spirit of humility, that phases of truth which did not arrest the attention and engage the thought of former ages are revealed to and apprehended by the mind of our own age. The horizon of truth has not been fixed by the intellectual and spiritual vision of former teachers

* *Lux Mundi*, page 8.

and pupils. The Holy Spirit continues to be the inspirer and guide of the Church, and promises fuller revelations of truth from age to age.

The mission of theology is not simply to serve as the custodian of the accumulated treasures of preceding ages, and to guard them as a heritage for the generations that follow, but to add new treasures and to make new disclosures from age to age. Such progress does not imply any change in the essential verities of divine revelation. At the same time, however, it should be borne in mind that theological science has to do with truth in its relation to the varying powers of human apprehension. In this respect theological science does not differ from the sciences which treat of the laws and forces of the natural world. Nature's forces existed in former centuries as they exist to-day, but how differently are they studied and applied. By the light of modern science the forces of nature are revealed to us as they could not be revealed to former generations, and the application of material forces is such as could not be foreseen by the wisest of the ancients. We accept without question the results of scientific study as applied to nature, and are eager to learn whatever new discoveries may be made by the inventive genius of the age.

Theology is a science which comprehends within its scope all things in heaven and in earth. Its investigations are pursued, it is true, mainly in the light and by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But it is equally true that these investigations are pursued by the mind of man as influenced by the light and spirit of the age. Just as one age in its thought and methods differs from another, so does the theology of one age differ from that of another. To attempt, as has been done under the sway of dogmatism, to bind theological thought back to the standards of a past age is manifestly contrary to the law of history and of mind. Such measures, to whatever extent they may be seasoned by pious zeal, do not guard and conserve the interests of truth. To the contrary they hinder its progress.

Theology can be no exception to the rule which governs all other sciences. The idea of progress holds in the very nature of

science. As applied to the discovery and unfolding of truth in the various departments of nature and of mind no objection is raised to the law of development. But such unrestricted progress, it is claimed by some, is contrary to the nature of theology, on the assumption that, as theology has to do with things divine, its standards should therefore be of such a fixed character as to admit of but little, if any, variation. It is true that theology, as regards its objective contents, has to do with Him who is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." As no other science it deals with realities eternal and unchangeable. But the science of theology relates itself no less to man, his rational powers, his apprehension of things divine. Revelation is always conditioned by the varying aptitude of men, by the intellectual and spiritual capacity of those who seek the truth.

We find, therefore, that theology conforms to the same law which rules the natural and metaphysical sciences. Its standards vary under the influence of the peculiar mental, moral and spiritual forces which distinguish one age from another. Its progress is not uniformly even. There are periods of repression, and what may seem to be retrogression. The consciousness of one age may not be retained in its fullness by a succeeding age, as shown in the serious falling off in the period immediately succeeding that of the apostles. Such retrogression, following seasons of unusual spiritual elevation, does not contradict the law of historical development. The movement in general is nevertheless onward and progressive. In the degree that it partakes of the nature of science, theology must open itself to the mind of the age and welcome to itself whatever of value it may have to contribute.

At the present time theology is exposed to the same influences which affect all other sciences. It is largely controlled by the searching, critical spirit which would "prove all things" by the application of scientific methods. The objection is raised that unbelieving rationalism employs like methods in its attack against the Christian faith. This may not be questioned. The present age is fraught with peculiar perils. Much mental and spiritual

disquietude has been caused through the raising of doubts as to the sources of religious knowledge. But as these perils are not the product of the scientific spirit, neither can they be overcome by the attempt to silence the voice of criticism, and by resisting scientific methods of investigation. The successful resistance of "science falsely so-called," can best be accomplished by a friendly alliance with true science, by enlisting its fullest service in the interests of Christ's kingdom. By its help men may secure that "reasoned conviction" as to the facts and doctrines of Christianity, which is the high reward of the Christian student, and which the writers of the New Testament sought to produce.

Scientific investigation does not imply unbelief, hostility to, or denial of the Christian faith. Its purpose is to verify, to attain certitude as to alleged facts. Is there anything to be feared from such source and methods? It is justly claimed as a strong proof of Christianity's legitimate tenure that it can encourage free inquiry into its title-deeds. We should have such confidence in our defenses and their impregnability as to be willing to face the enemy at every point of attack. If, in the conflict with the forces of unbelief, we discover that our weapons and armor are weak by reason of the admixture of error and ignorance, then there is but one course to pursue, namely, to enlighten ignorance and to eliminate error. If in the quest after truth we discover that our vision has been contracted, then must we rise to a higher plane that truth's horizon may be enlarged, and that we may see with clearer vision. To this end we should welcome light from every possible source—the light of the Holy Spirit, the light of nature, the light of reason, the light of modern science, the light of Christian scholarship, so that we may be led onward into an ever-widening realm where new disclosures may be made to us and fuller revelations of truth become our possession.

Now, it must be acknowledged that these phases of recent theology—its liberal tendency, its impressibility, and its close affiliation with other sciences—appear in marked contrast with the sternness, the rigidity and exclusiveness of the older systems. And it is not strange that in the transition there should be a re-

action accompanied with more or less violence. The abandonment of old wine-skins always excites provocation and protest.

The contrast between the old order and the new becomes very apparent when we inquire into the main characteristics of present theological thought.

Modern theology differs widely from the older systems in its diminishing regard for, if not aversion to the use of metaphysics, and in giving prominence more particularly to the ethical side of religion. It throws open for fresh consideration problems which, for a long time, had been sealed up in ecclesiastical dogmas, and gives to them a vitality and power both in the sphere of theological thought and that of practical religious life, which they could not have under the rule of traditional orthodoxy. They are being brought into sympathetic touch with the mind and heart of the age.

In emphasizing the truth that Christianity is life rather than dogma, theology is finding a congenial home for itself on earth. Nor does it lose any of its heavenly properties by being brought down out of the clouds into the abodes of men where the minds and hearts of the unlearned may share with scholastics the knowledge of the deep things of God.

The doctrine of God is presented in a light in which all who will may see. And the knowledge of God is made as real for men as that which through the senses they obtain of the external world. What God is in His ontological relations and transcendental attributes, may or may not be known to those who profess to be schooled in the esoteric mysteries; but what God is in relation to His own children and to the world, is a knowledge open to all who from the heart profess belief in Him as the Father. The love of God, which is something more than an attribute of Deity, defines, as nothing else can, the essential nature of the Divine Being. This is regarded by new theology as the starting point of all Christian theology, for the reason that it brings God face to face with man in the relation of a father to his child. It is also the true *anfangspunkt* for the study of all of God's relations to man and to the world. Only in the light of this regu-

lative principle may the metaphysical relations of Deity be studied by theologians who delight to contemplate the being of God in His pretemporal and purely heavenly sphere. And to those who are content to contemplate God within the sphere of revelation, there is presented a view of God, of man and the world, and of their relations to one another, which serves to correct the one-sided conception of Augustinianism, as well as the false views of materialism and Pantheism. At the same time, it gives due recognition to the truth of natural theology, of ethnic religions, and of the various systems of philosophical and religious belief taught by all searchers after truth in pre-Christian times.

A phase, perhaps I should say a system, of theology expounded by a certain group of Christian thinkers, and which at present attracts considerable attention, appears under the title of "Christocentric." It is so named because it identifies Christianity with the doctrine of the person of Christ. The simple creed of this new theology is that Christ is a unique being who incarnates the love of God, and satisfies perfectly all the requirements of ideal humanity.

It is not entirely free from mystical and philosophical tendencies, as may be inferred from such phrases as "the Eternal Filial" and "the Christ in Deity." It professes, however, to confine its scope to the revelation of Christ on the fact-basis of His earthly history. The doctrine of pre-existence transcends the sphere of revelation, and also the limits of human apprehension, and is of no value to the science of theology because it has no direct bearing on Christian experience. The historical foundations of Christianity as these are laid in the Gospel history are adequate for the doctrine of the Divine nature of Jesus. He is the perfect revealer of God; and the revelation of Divinity is one with the revelation of perfect humanity.

In Christocentric theology there is a reaction against the old orthodoxy which exalted the Divine at the expense of the human in Jesus. It allows no abridgement of the nature and laws of humanity in Jesus, but enlarges the conception of both to the

fullest possible extent, and claims at the same time by this means to exalt equally His divine nature. This theology gives special prominence to the Father-nature of God, and to the perfect ideal human life as lived by Jesus. It is a practical, simple Gospel which makes an appeal to the heart as well as to the mind.

It bids all to worship, obey and love Jesus. To have the same mind which was in Him, to possess His spirit, is salvation. This is the Christianity of the Gospels as taught by its Founder.

To the readers of this REVIEW who, for fully half a century, have been familiar with Christocentric theology, and have contended for it against various forms of error, it may seem a surprising thing to hear it announced that "a certain group of thinkers propose a new theology known as Christocentric." Here there might be occasion to quarrel for honors not rightly placed, if one were to yield to petty denominational pride. The only regret is that the Christocentric theology long familiar to Mercersburg and Lancaster should at so late a day find its way to New England and Old England. It would be interesting to note, from the standpoint of this REVIEW, the differences of the two theological systems which claim to be controlled by the same great principle, but criticism is not the purpose of this paper. Reference is made in this connection to the professedly new Christocentric theology not because it appears under an old name, but because it is new theology notwithstanding the old name. The quality of newness must be ascribed to it as taught in its original home no less than as expounded by later disciples in other parts. If at times it has seemed to lack much of its former freshness and vigor, this has been due, perhaps, to the error of regarding it as a finished product of the earlier master minds. It does not diminish the high honor which the theological world attaches to the names of Nevin and Schaff, to say that these eminent and earliest teachers of Christocentric theology in America simply led the way in the study of theology from a new and better standpoint as compared with that of former doctrinal standards. They wrote no final chapter. They did not profess to set bounds to the realm of truth into which they led and accom-

panied their pupils. As prophets they pointed the way to a fuller apprehension and wider application of the theological and philosophical principles which they taught.

It may be said, therefore, that Christocentric theology has a larger meaning for men to-day than it could have fifty or twenty-five years ago. As appropriated by Biblical theology it is opening anew many of the old theological problems that were closed by doctrinal fiat. God, man, the relation of God to man, Christ in His relation to the Father and to man, the Kingdom of God, the Church, the Sacraments, ecclesiastical polity, Christianity in relation to human government, the sociological and economic problems of the age—all these questions, old and new, are demanding earnest study, and, as believed by many thoughtful minds, can find their proper solution only in the light of the Christocentric principle.

New theology applies critical methods to the study of the Bible. That does not mean an assault upon the Bible. It means a clearer, more enlightened apprehension and more rational appreciation of the Word of God. A theology that would rest upon the Bible as "the only rule of faith and practice" very justly asks that the Bible be widely opened, and that nothing be hid which can be made manifest. It asks that every page and line and letter be examined under the most searching light that can be shed upon them. It will have all the facts pertaining to the history of the Bible made known. It accepts the Bible as the Word of God and as the work of man. As a book composed by many authors of varied talent, transcribed over and over again, often by careless hands, some of its pages annotated, others subjected to editorial revision—as a book passing through many vicissitudes—it is not exempt from the laws of literature.

Theological science does not transcend its province when it invites thorough inspection of every part of the Bible, and presses to the utmost limits questions pertaining to the purity and integrity of the text, "proving all things," so that it may "hold fast that which is good." If purity of text be essential to correct interpretation, there should be nothing to fear from Textual

Criticism, whose aim is to recover, as far as possible, the original Scriptures. Rather should the results of such critical investigation be gratefully accepted as valuable aids to intelligent Bible study.

Criticism goes a step further, and inquires into the antecedents and credentials of each separate book. It applies the tests of science to ascertain, if possible, the authorship and date, the sources from which the author drew, the peculiar circumstances of his age, the various influences which aided in shaping his thought, and thereby to obtain all possible information as to the origin and structure of every book of the Bible. If such questions should be answered at all, it is of utmost importance that they be answered correctly. This is the aim of Higher Criticism. Its purpose, as pursued by Christian scholars, is to bring to light all available data which may be of service in the study of the Bible as literature, with the view to correct misconception and misinterpretation, and to bring the Bible nearer to the hearts of men by making it clearer to their understanding.

New theology makes room for Historical Criticism. By means of it alleged historical facts are investigated in order to ascertain the basis of reality on which they rest. Bible history is entitled to no less thorough study and research than secular history. It merits more because it is Bible history. If we admit that Christianity is a historical religion, and that it bases its claims ultimately upon the actual occurrence in human history of certain visible and audible events, then no one may deny the right and duty of inquiring into the exact nature of these events, and of seeking all available information concerning them not only from the Bible, but also from collateral sources.

This is the work of Historical Criticism. It applies scientific methods in testing the validity, and in determining—so far as it can determine by scientific methods—the meaning of Biblical history. It pursues in like manner the study of Christian doctrine and Church History, and seeks to ascertain from all available sources to what extent doctrinal belief and ecclesiastical polity have been fashioned and modified by the manifold forces which have been operative in human history and civilization.

Criticism turns its burning light upon every phase of religious thought and life. Problems in doctrine, polity and cultus are being re-studied from new standpoints, and that the results are largely influencing religious belief may not be questioned.

It is not argued that scientific methods are the means above all others best adapted for acquiring and promoting religious truth, and that the critical function is of primary importance as applied to things spiritual.

As a reaction against the former sway of traditionalism, as an extreme begotten by an extreme, the scientific spirit may have assumed undue prominence in controlling the religious thought of the age, and it is probable that the results will not prove in all respects satisfactory. But, on the other hand, there should be no hesitancy in acknowledging that new interest has been awakened in every department of theological science, and that contributions of incalculable value have been made to the fund of religious knowledge as the result of the application of scientific methods.

New theology has made friends with the scientific and critical spirit, and by its aid investigates truth in the light of human reason as well as in the light of the divine Spirit. It obviates thereby a conflict between religion and science, between faith and reason. It does not distinguish as widely as theology hitherto has done between the natural and supernatural, and thus avoids a dualism between God and nature. It views the universe as one, over which and in which God rules. His presence and power are revealed in the ordinary course of nature and history as well as in miraculous phenomena and portentous events.

All laws and forces in the natural and spiritual realms are under the direction of His will, and conserve a common purpose and a common end. New theology, therefore, recognizes all truth as having a common source. The truths of science, philosophy and religion in their last analysis are one. All are of God. All sciences which have the truth of nature as their object, are the handmaids of religion. Inherently there can be no conflict between science and religion. Nature and revelation are both the expression of the divine mind. Fortunately there is a grow-

ing recognition of the unity of truth, which is fast overcoming the barriers which hitherto have kept religion and science apart. Their complete union is possible, because theology is seeking Christ and Christ is the truth, while science is seeking the truth and the truth is Christ.*

Consistently with its conception of the unity of the universe new theology maintains also the idea of the unity and continuity of human life. It does not draw a broad line of separation between the present world and that which is to come. Whatever power death may have in the way of effecting a transition, a mysterious change, it does not break the course of life's development. Of itself, death has no transforming power upon personality and character. It does not save, nor does it condemn.

New theology gives encouragement to the "larger hope." It allows the possibility of entrance into the Kingdom to those who have passed into the death state without having willfully rejected the truth as it is in Jesus.

It raises the questions: Whether it is within the province of Christian dogma to issue the decree that all hope of repentance and redemption necessarily ends with the grave, and whether souls that struggled through conflicts and doubts after light, which was not seen this side of the grave, shall, by means of death, be plunged into eternal and hopeless darkness?

The relation of the Reformed Church to the later developments in theological science has been plainly indicated throughout the present discussion. The Reformed Church has never wavered in fidelity to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith as these are set forth in the brief and simple statements of the Apostles' Creed. This ancient symbol is the foundation upon which rests the entire structure of the symbolical and theological literature of the Reformed Church. The Apostles' Creed holds a central place in the Heidelberg Catechism, and, like a beating heart, warms with its vitalizing power every part of the system. Further, the Apostles' Creed regulates

* Recent Tendencies in Theological Thought, *The American Journal of Theology*; January, 1897, p. 121.

the Pericopes, the scriptural selections, which are adapted to the cycle of the Christian year. Likewise the theology of the Reformed Church, throughout its history, has rested upon, and found its regulative principle in this brief but unexcelled symbol of faith.

Holding firmly to the essential and unchangeable facts of Christianity, as expressed in the articles of the creed, all of which relate themselves directly to the person of Christ as the central object of faith, the Reformed Church has always felt secure as to the foundations of its doctrinal teaching, and has allowed, perhaps, exceptional freedom in the development of theological science.

It recognizes the fact that the Christian thinks as well as believes, and that the apprehension of truth varies from age to age, and, therefore, it has never formulated a fixed doctrinal standard which should serve as a mould for the religious thought of succeeding generations. Reformed theology has always been new and progressive. While honoring the past and the standards of the past, it cannot rest content with the truth as wrought out in former ages. It would ever move forward, seeking to attain to higher planes, that it may apprehend the truth with clearer vision and in larger measure.

Such is its attitude to-day. It will accept no system of theology, whether belonging to the past or present, as the embodiment of all truth. It retains and cherishes the truth of old theology, and, at the same time, warmly welcomes the truth of the new. It asserts its claim upon all truth, and would have the scope of theological science so enlarged as to allow unrestricted freedom of inquiry and research along every line that has been opened or may be opened by the mind of man in its quest after new light and more truth.

The truth shall make men free, and as freedom comes by truth so does truth advance by freedom.

II.

THE PRESENT TREND OF THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY REV. J. I. SWANDER, D. D.

The writer's visit to the leading Presbyterian city in the world afforded him a rare opportunity to observe and compare a few of the various methods of ecclesiastical thinking now prevalent, if not predominant, in the compass of an ever-restless and inquiring Christendom. Arriving in Glasgow June 16, 1896, and alighting from the London Day Express, we found ourself, first of all, impressed with the presumptuous and pretentious ecclesiasticism of narrow-gauged Presbyterian glory. The coming together of "The Alliance of Reformed Churches" in the sixth General Council was liberally preannounced by large and attractive posters. On our way through the crowded streets to the Windsor Hotel we could read the evidence of our arrival: "Twenty millions of Presbyterians represented in the city; three hundred Presbyterian delegates in Glasgow from all parts of the world; the Pan-Presbyterian assembly will convene on the 17th in St. Andrew's Hall." Great is Presbyteriology!

On the morning of the 17th, as a recipient of unbounded Scotch hospitality, under the Christian care and direction of the local management of the "Pan," and forgetful of the fact that our certificate as a delegate from the Reformed Church in the United States was a testimonial of our appointment to the "Alliance," we immediately fell into the "Pan" and joined the trend of theological thought or thoughtlessness to the Barony Church, whence the company proceeded to the Cathedral. At the Cathedral, both the "Pan" and the "Alliance" were apparently left out of mind. The imposing and impressive service was such as to render the occasion a sweet communion of saints in the fellowship of a broad and catholic conception of the Gospel. The spiritual

edification and delight of the hour received no little assistance from the very appropriate and truly gospel sermon preached by that advance agent of Scotch theology, Dr. Marshall Lang, who left his audience under the impression that he was fully abreast with the world's leading trend of stalwart and progressive theological thinking. Although a genuine Scotchman of Glasgow, he seems to have inherited not only a German name, but also the German method of apprehending the truth. Indeed it was intimated that he had been drinking deep at the Pierian spring of German literature. His great convocational and communion sermon on "The Church as the body of Christ" was very properly regarded by many as a keynote to the tune of future Presbyterian theology. That his sermon found approval in the general theological sentiment of the "Alliance," and that the preacher had the full confidence of the "Pan" was shown beyond a doubt when the Council, at one of its subsequent sessions, elected him by a unanimous vote as its next President, at the 7th assembly of the Alliance to convene at Washington city in 1899.

Aside from the reading of current theological literature, there is probably no means on earth that affords more correct information concerning the various methods of theological thinking and inquiry than regular attendance upon, and close attention at the sessions of a great assembly like that convened in Glasgow in 1896. It was the writer's privilege to be present at twenty of those sessions and, to some little extent, take part in the proceedings and discussions growing out of the very excellent papers read in St. Andrew's Hall on nearly a hundred phases of the general subject under consideration by that pious and scholarly assemblage of Christian men convened from different parts of our general Christendom. Having availed ourself of the means of information indicated above, we re-crossed the Atlantic fully convinced that the Church has not yet reached its theological Millennium.

We are probably safe in assuming, without fear of reasonable contradiction, the correctness of the following propositions: 1. The Millennium will in some sense be the closing chapter of the

world's great history. 2. History, unless it should meet with the catastrophe of a terrible abortion, involves a process destined to culminate in perfection. 3. Such process is not primarily one of accretion, but of development, progress and triumph. 4. Such triumph must of constitutional necessity be sufficiently broad to include, not only the victory of holiness over sin and life over death, but also that of truth over error; truth must triumph gloriously. 5. Such triumph means vastly more than the overthrow of error and the dispersion of its darkness; truth must triumph for itself and be glorified for its own sake. 6. Such glorification implies a twofold process, viz.: A revelation from and by the Divine and Infinite to and through the human and the finite; and also such a clear and full apprehension of the former by the latter as to reflect the image of the Personal Divine and Infinite, like the sea of glass round about the throne.

This reflective process which looks toward and is destined to culminate in a full and final apprehension of the absolute truth is carried forward through legitimate and persistent scientific inquiry after, and investigation of the revealed, yet deep things of God. Although divine revelation is twofold in form, through the Holy Scriptures and Nature, it is only one in fact. So science, though manifold in the several immediate fields of its inquiry, is nevertheless one in its scope and ultimate purpose. The distinction between theology and science is without foundation in fact. Theology is no less a science, but rather more so, because its peculiar realm of truth is explored in the exercise of Christian faith, as well as human reason. Theology is the queen of sciences. They are the vestal virgins in attendance at her holy altar. "Theology," says Dr. Augustus H. Strong, "seeks Christ and Christ is the truth, while science seeks the truth and the truth is Christ." The foregoing sentence contains truth, yet it may not be unqualifiedly true to state that "the truth is Christ."

That the foregoing views are not entirely out of line and harmony with the leading trend of modern theological thought is clearly evident from up-to-date current theological literature. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, whatever may be thought of his higher criti-

cisms, must be acknowledged as one of the most vigorous thinkers, versatile scholars, progressive theologians and fearless writers of the present time. His recent paper on "The Scope of Theology" may be regarded as fairly indicating the present tendency of inquiry and progress. According to his view, the properly arranged seminary course of study includes the whole range of sciences, because "all the sciences spring from theology as their common mother, and tend to theology as their common goal."

Philology, philosophy, the physical sciences, psychology, historic theology, medicine and law belong, in all their proper ramifications, to the household of the mother queen, and should be permitted to accompany and assist her in her onward and upward march to prepare the way for the absolute truth and make His paths straight.

Progress, in the sense of development in the science of theology, or, for that matter, in any other science, can neither be recognized nor satisfactorily viewed, only by thinkers whose minds are endowed with at least some little degree of philosophical acuteness. There must be a clear distinction made and kept between truth as something having objective being, and any possible apprehension thereof, as that which is notionally subjective, and subject to modification or change in the minds of men. Evolution may not be predicated of truth as to its divine essence, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." It belongs to the realm and onflow of history. It is God's method of doing things in time. Viewed as such, who is afraid of it? Only those fixed and finished theologians whose pessimistic and atomistic methods of unprogressive thought lead them to accomplish but little more than to scare the children, and immortalize their mechanical theories in dessicated orthodoxy.

What then is truth as it comes from the realm eternal and source divine through a progressive revelation to man, to the intent that it may be apprehended by the human in the realm of the historic? "Truth," says Dr. J. W. Nevin, "is not something abstract, existing only as a notion or unsubstantial thought. It is

actual being and substance, and lives everywhere instinct with the life of God Himself. It is not an accidental outward and separable quality of other things anywhere, but the very inmost essence and sense of all normal things, the original necessity of their existence, and the self-active power and force by which they continually subsist. This character of substantiality and vitality belongs to truth first of all only in the Lord Himself. He is the absolute truth, as He is for that reason the absolute life, the one involving the other. Those then who think of either life or truth as having in itself any existence for either men or angels in separate view, or as something disparted from life and truth in God, may be sure that they labor here under fundamental mistake." It is partially because the leading theological thinkers of the present age, assisted by recent archæological, philological and psychological discoveries, are no longer obliged to labor under the above-mentioned fundamental mistake, that the highway for development and progress has been opened up and broadened for the incoming century of the Christian era.

The present trend of theological thought is measurably retarded in its movement by several circling eddies of inquiry along the current as to the primary source of knowledge essential to the solution of the problems toward which the science is now bending its best energies. These alleged sources are various, and differ according to the points of view respectively occupied ecclesiastically or otherwise. Romanism lays stress upon the Church, Protestantism upon the Bible and Rationalism upon reason as sources of knowledge. It matters but little what Romanism teaches on any subject touching the general question of theological science, because she is confessionally and traditionally committed against all proper progress. "It would be unreasonable," says Dr. Van Oosterzee, "to prescribe to the function of reason an unconditional silence" in searching after the knowledge of divine things. "The written word," says Dr. E. V. Gerhart, "is in one view a valid source of knowledge, but under another view it is not. It is a derived and subordinate source, but not original and fontal. Such subordinate source it is only when held in its

internal and vital connection with the entire economy of the Messianic revelation." This last view is fundamental and in harmony with the central tendency of all Evangelical and scientific theology which is just now emphasizing the fact that in Jesus Christ "are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden."

The truth expressed in the foregoing quotation from Col. 2:2, is received as a matter of course by the entire Christian world, while its various interpretations and applications to the science of theology are widely different. This fact was probably more fully demonstrated in the proceedings and discussions of the recent great Council at Glasgow than is generally obvious from even a careful reading of the representative ecclesiastical literature of the times. There was to some degree a manifest feeling that even Presbyterianism had, in some sense, drifted away from some cardinal point of the Christian compass. "Let us get back to first principles," was in substance the desire and purpose of all. But what are first principles, and where shall we find them? was echoed from the other side of St. Andrew's Hall. "We shall find them with the Fathers; let us hurry back with rapid speed and according to standard time," was suggested by the left center of the orthodox. Dr. Blackie was of the opinion that we ought to go back to the Grandfathers, meaning, probably, St. Augustine and the theologians of a more primitive age. Others thought that we had better get back to the Apostles, provided, however, that no concession be made to the Anglican claim of finger-tip succession. At this point the United Presbyterians from Canada suggested that we had better go back to the Psalms of David. Then, after Isaac Watts and the organ had been put to silence by the magnanimous suggestion of Dr. Lang, it was tacitly agreed that we should all go back to Christ. But in what sense? Is the Church of history to retrace its history to obtain the truth from the historic Christ—"the forerunner?" Heb. 6:20. It was interesting, and at times smile-provoking to listen to those learned pious children from every continent of the world piping a thousand samples of their theological wares. Of course there was a union of hearts and a harmony of voices in every move-

ment that would crown Immanuel Lord of all, but, as with Pilate of old, the troublous question would constantly arise from the standpoint of each theological school: "What more shall we do with Jesus?" It was claimed by each one that Christ was central in his own compilation of biblical doctrines or catalogue of theological tenets; yet it was apparent to a close observer that the centrality of Christ's person was generally accorded a place in the plan of salvation in a sense somewhat similar to that in which the Kohinoor diamond might be regarded as having found its proper setting in a jeweled cluster of less precious and less brilliant stones.

It is not according to anything like the foregoing conception of Christ's relation to theology that He is held by the most vigorous and leading type of Christian thought. The cardinal principle of this truly progressive theological science is the theanthropic person of Immanuel. What think ye of Christ? is now the test question of all doctrinal systems. What relation is His person recognized as sustaining to the human race and to all the departments of human learning? Is He recognized as the generic man, the second Adam, the refounder and reorganizer of the human family, upon a higher plane of human being, with a broader field of human activity and a higher goal of human destiny? This Christo-fontal and Christological question has been coming to the front for several decades of anxious years. The fundamental principle that it proclaims is evidently destined to work itself into the blood and fiber of all theology worthy of the name, until the theological teachings of all the Christian schools shall send their flashes of new inspiration through all the world and to all the inhabitants thereof. It is even now stimulating much thoughtful Christian scholarship to a higher recognition of Christ as the architect, archetype, foundation and crowning glory of all religious, ethical and philosophical superstructures not constructed out of the wood, hay and stubble whose only element of worth is excellent combustibility. It is through such an organic and growing apprehension of the personal and absolute truth that the wisdom of God in a mystery becomes the wisdom of man in

history. "And look that thou make them after the pattern which was shown thee in the Mount." Ex. 25:40. This command has not lost its force, neither has it passed away with those Heaven-ordained types of better things to come. Obedience to the general principle underlying that injunction, made the son of Pharaoh's daughter illustrious, and his work enduring through all the ages. It was no mistake of Moses. Neither did the great pioneer and master builder in modern theological thought make a mistake when Dr. J. Williamson Nevins wrote: "It is the order of things in Heaven reaching down into the condition of things on earth, that serves to impart to these any significance they can ever have in the way of resemblance to heavenly things." It should, therefore, ever be held and must be allowed to govern as a principle of general application that "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." It applies to wisely-built religious institutions and doctrinal systems no less than to the saints who have the promise of a glorious resurrection in virtue of their mystical union with that same Second Adam who is now reconstructing all things after Himself, the Archetype. All Christians are lively stones in the edifice now in the process of erection; some are builders and a few are master builders, but Christ still continues to build His Church, and to mould everything pertaining thereto in such sense as to have and hold the organic preëminence. The whole must conform to the heavenly personal "pattern in the Mount"—Mount Zion. The life and truth of the personal Christ is the moulding power within and from within. Hence it follows that the Church and everything pertaining organically thereto is ordained and freely destined to take such form, and ultimately only such form as will be fairly and fully responsive to the personal pattern therein. Any attempt therefore, either in the way of ecclesiastical legislation, confessional compilations of fragmentary truths or even mere logical reasonings, to mold the rising and prevailing theology of the future, will prove to have just about as much effect as the crowing of the cock upon the heaven-ordained ordinance of sunrise.

This movement in stalwart theological thinking is destined, in

the solution of the problems that confront it, to eliminate much now tolerated by virtue of old traditions in the present system of orthodoxy, reject much of the so-called Christian doctrine which is yet to be tested of what sort it is, and incorporate much that has hitherto been kept under the ban of the standards. Unitarianism, humanitarianism and all Christless theories of sociology, together with the logical results of their teachings will be repelled and cast on desert shore to perish in the destructive winds of heaven. Some of the tentative theories now held in speculative theology may triumphantly pass the test of the newly kindled old fires by which every man's work is to be tried: For example, the question of the eternal humanity of Christ; whether the eternal Son would have become incarnate if man had not sinned, as held and openly advocated by Liebner, Martensen, Ebrard, Dorner and others; whether salvation is to be offered to the millions of heathen who are now in the hades realm, that "hell may open her dolorous portals" to the Gospel's heavenly light.

It is also a faithful saying worthy of all acceptance that this Christological and historical theology does not radically antagonize or aim to destroy the essential parts of any doctrine or tenet of the faith once delivered to the saints. For example, the divine Sovereignty, the elective prerogative of the absolute One, the fatherhood of God, the eternal sonship of Jesus Christ, the personality of the Holy Ghost, the brotherhood of man, universal depravity on account of sin, justification by faith—these, with all other obvious teachings of the Bible, whether formulated into confessions or otherwise held, will be neither ignored nor set aside as of less importance than as generally held in the creeds of Christendom. It is claimed, however, that they are to take their respective positions in the periphery and around the center of a more organic system. As now placed and viewed in the atomistic and manufactured plans of salvation none of these doctrines appear in their truth and beauty. It is not proposed to shoot a new theological meteor into the skies to serve as a new luminary, but to permit the old Sun of righteousness to arise with healing

in His wings. It is only with such a sunrise that a better theological day is ushered in. Christ as the illuminative center will drive the Ptolemaic system of unphilosophical theology away. The science of Christology will then have a different meaning because of the ready recognition of a more proper and organic relation to anthropology, soteriology and ecclesiology.

The common element of comparative weakness in some of the theological systems of the world is not that they are destitute of the truth as to their several parts. Their incompleteness consists neither in a want of quantity nor quality, but in the lack of organic wholeness. A fragmentary collection of even perfect parts does not necessarily constitute a perfect whole. One of the weaknesses of much theology is a defective ecclesiology. Although the Church question has been prominently before the Church for half a century, the institution is not yet clearly conscious of itself as an organic constitution. The truth of the foregoing sentence was made clear to close observers in the great Glasgow alliance. The faith of that large Cathedral audience was much better than its theology. When Dr. Lang preached his opening sermon on the Church as the body of Christ, his audience was frequently electrified with some of the fairest samples of gospel lightning ever liberated from the clouds of the upper world. It was interesting, to those of us who watched as well as prayed, to see the old Scotch divines receive the flashes of Christocentric truth with a relish that caused them to smile themselves into a comparatively high degree of Presbyterian felicity. The next day the ceilings of St. Andrew's Hall echoed the old distinction between the visible and the invisible Church. What nonsense! In this particular holding what advantage has Protestantism over popery? Is a head with two bodies any less a monstrosity than a body with two heads? A sound Christology must bring with it a correct and consistent ecclesiology; and it seems reasonable to expect that the Christological sentiment which is now laying hold of the best life and learning of the Christian world will soon come to see, as Dr. Marshall Lang stated in his convocational sermon in Glasgow, that a "body" is

not a mere aggregation of materials thrown together in a convenient and comely shape, not a mere organization, but an organism, incorporating not only members, but invisible forces and functions which grow out of and are ever resident in that order of life which is in the world by virtue of the incarnation, and which is now unfolding itself in the *One Holy Catholic Church*.

It follows, moreover, that the development of this Christocentric idea, when complemented with a corresponding ecclesiology, will not only retain all the elements of truth now possessed by the several old theories of the atonement, but also restate and incorporate them in a system of theology more consistent with itself, and more in harmony with a growing Christian consciousness and its reasonable demands. In obedience to such demands the science of soteriology must so modify itself as to fall more fully into line with better conceptions of the character of God. Such modification is not only possible, but also necessitated by that Christocentric Sun which can never be the center of any theological system in which each part is not organically related according to that which every joint supplieth. Without such organic relations the new theology would be worse than the old. It would be merely a new patch on an old garment, or the sewing of an old patch on a new crazy quilt. In either case the rent would be made worse. How, for example, could a sound Christological theology have room for any of those old theories of the atonement which now seem to have had no other aim than to keep God out of trouble and to give the devil his dues. The Anselmic theory, which moulded many of the doctrines of the Reformation and shaped the standards subsequently produced, would and should be saved as to all the "gold, silver and precious stones" which it contains, but such salvation is possible only by the fire of that higher criticism and development which belong to God's method of moving things on to superlative perfection.

The origin and history of this Christological tendency in modern theology have already received considerable mention in the January number of this REVIEW. Whether it be an outgrowth of the Hegelian philosophy, as charged by some, or a

product of New England's inventive genius, as claimed by others, need not be discussed in this paper. Suffice it to say that the movement is on in cumulative force, with staying as well as progressive qualities. In a proper sense of the term it is a new theology; in another sense it is not. It roots itself in the fertile soil of the past, unfolds itself as the current of years rolls by, and will go on to perfection in that great hereafter which is close at hand. Free to be bound by the true of the past, bound to be free from the error of the present and inspired by the hope of full freedom in the future, it is already playing its progressive parts before a more appreciative audience than the one that tried to hiss it from the stage a half century ago. On the 8th of April, 1848, the *New York Observer*, standing then upon the highest watch-tower of perfected orthodoxy, denounced the theology of Dr. Schaff as "German transcendentalism." In less than a quarter of a century after the promulgation of that Protestant bull the German transcendentalist had become the biggest Indian in the revisionary wilderness of Presbyterianism. So goes the world around. The men who were cannonaded in the middle of the 19th century are canonized at its close. Some seminaries that once taught theology according to the Standards are now teaching that the Standards should be revised and raised according to some higher rule. There is a growing consciousness that the personal, historic Christ is the only creed that needs no revision. This fact was made distinctly clear in the frequent flashes of light from some of the most vigorous and logical thinkers in the Glasgow Assembly. In view of the foregoing facts it seems that the night is far spent, and that the day is at hand. Let the day star continue to arise, and the central movement in theological science continue to go forward in the light of its own achievements, with a sweep of power that no prejudice can resist and worthy of the vital principle it involves.

TIFFIN, O., February, 1897.

III.

THE WITNESS OF JESUS TO HIMSELF AND CHRISTIANITY.*

BY REV. A. S. WEBER, A. M.

Many of the foremost theological minds of our day are earnestly engaged in studying anew the witness of Jesus to Himself and Christianity. Wearied and unsatisfied by the accumulated traditional forms and theories of religious thought, they have laid them aside, and, like men thirsting after pure water, turned to the personal Fountain in Whom there is a revelation of all truth. Their favorite cry "Back to Christ," sometimes too narrowly interpreted, indicates that it is by Jesus' witness alone they propose testing and verifying whatever is to be given authentic place in the Christian Theology of the future. It is not strange that this cry should be calling out enthusiastic followers in constantly increasing numbers, so reasonable seems the purpose, so full of promise the method that is to be pursued. Nor is it strange that the intellectual results of the movement should be so rapidly multiplying. Not a few of the most interesting and helpful productions in current theological discussion are inspired by the principle, and the direct outgrowth of the method to which reference is here made.

Among these there is a volume of last year whose marks of theological insight and power, combined with a rare felicity of literary execution and finish, make it worthy perhaps of being called a work of genius. The book notices of *THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW* have already directed attention to it, but its character and contents seem to deserve the somewhat more particular examination which in this connection it is proposed to give them. One needs not to read far into *The Mind of the Master* to

* "The Mind of the Master," by John Watson, D.D., Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, 1896.

discover that the title of the book is indicative of its aim and purpose, its method and results. The author of it belongs to the school of thought that is laboring for the reconstruction of doctrinal formulas according to the word and spirit of the great Teacher come from God, and to free them from all bondage to creed or confessional standard. He does not conceal his impatience with the dogmas of the past that "once flowed molten from hearts fired with divine love, but have now run down into a mould and settled into a cast-iron shape." He applauds the earnestness of men who are "dissatisfied not with principles, but their forms, and therefore make a clean sweep of dogma; who raze the building to the ground, and then examine the foundations, the elementary facts and experiences of revelation." He believes that already "a few swallows" are heralding the better spring that is approaching, and mentions Dr. Fairbairn's Christ in Modern Theology, and Canon Gore's Incarnation as "the beginning of a time, a time for which many are praying." His own volume, though more modest in pretention, and less systematic and comprehensive in purpose, is deserving of a place side by side with those remarkable and justly famous books.

If reliance can be put in what appear to be authentic reports as to the large sales of *The Mind of the Master*, no recent contribution to theological thought has received so wide a reading from the public in general as Dr. Watson's volume. It is certain that for some time none has furnished ministerial and theological circles with a more interesting theme for discussion, or the religious magazines and journals a richer topic for review. Such facts, however, will not commend the book to those who always look askance upon a widely read author, and regard with suspicion the pages he has written. But no one will discover Dr. Watson to be pandering to a vicious popular taste, or to be supplying light and frivolous thought to satisfy a perverse theological opinion on the part of the public. The enthusiastic reception given the volume must be accounted for in some other way.

This may be done in part, no doubt, by the stimulus which

had been given to public desire for the author's writings by his previously published semi-fictitious books. The simplicity, the moral earnestness, the beauty, the pathos of those publications, all of which have a distinct ethical and even spiritual purpose, had won a large constituency ready to welcome this more stately, if not more serious, effort of his gifted pen. In part also, the happily chosen name given to his book must have contributed to the same end. Somewhere he indignantly declares it to be "an impudent assertion that people of average intelligence have no interest in theology," adding that "if anyone dares to deal with questions of faith after an understanding fashion he has the wind with him. Since the early morn, when the echo of Christ's footsteps was still on earth, and His very appearance in the flesh was remembered, there surely has been no age wherein Christians were so anxious to understand what Jesus was and what He taught. The trend of the graver intelligence among the public is evident and is distinctly toward those great questions which form the substance of the Christian faith, and lie at the foundation of religion." The very name of the book is a challenge to those "anxious to understand Jesus," an invitation to "the graver intelligence among the public" to read its pages essaying to give an honest and earnest interpretation to the mind, the spirit, the teaching of Christ with reference to the themes brought under discussion. And the wide reading his book is receiving would seem to be a vindication of the claim that Christian doctrine properly dealt with does find favor with the people, and is not the despised thing that superficial observers have imagined and declared it to be.

It is to the character and contents of the book itself, however, rather than to its name, and the literary fame of its author, that the extraordinary warmth of welcome it has met with, must be referred. The subjects which it discusses in the light of Gospel testimony, are some of the great and absorbing themes of the spiritual life. The treatment of them, characterized by a broad-minded charity, and a refreshing simplicity, is always interesting and suggestive. The entire absence of worn-out words and

phrases from theologies that are regarded obsolete, gives a crisp, fresh atmosphere to every page. There is no want of acquaintance however, on the author's part with doctrinal systems of the past. Repeated allusions by single word, and more extended direct reference to those systems, show with what a light touch and graceful movement a scholarly theologian of the new school can pass them by.

Though not a theologian in the ordinary sense of the word, Dr. Watson, in his pages, is constantly disclosing the spirit of a theologian combined with the spirit of a poet—an intellectual love of the truth, with a spiritual vision of its relations, significance and power. The book has nothing of a controversial air about it. The result of its inquiries are set forth with a grace of calmness and ease that wins regard even where it fails to command one's approval. Thus, for instance, the results of the literary criticism of the Bible, when taken as established, are announced here and there, as quietly and confidently as if the writer had no knowledge of the discipline visited by his own Scotch communism upon others whose views he shares. Every chapter of his book reveals a heart made tender by communion with the Master's spirit, and a mind honestly and fearlessly in quest of the truth simply as confirmed by the witness of Jesus recorded in the Gospels. When the truth is missed, as to my mind at not unimportant places it is missed, one feels that this is owing, not to preconceived notions or ulterior doctrinal designs, but rather to errors of interpretation or logical inconsistencies into which he has been inadvertently betrayed. And better than all this, one lays down the book when the end of it is reached, with the conviction that, whilst imperfect here and calling for modification or correction there, its evident purpose is to magnify the Son of Man and to declare Him to be the Son of God; to show the divine character of His teaching, the supreme authority of His claims, and to commend the same to the acceptance of all for the improvement and perfecting of social conditions and relations, and for the guidance, the ennobling, the solace of individual life.

In support of this general estimate of *The Mind of the*

Master many characteristic passages from its several chapters would readily lend themselves, were there space at one's command for their reproduction. The end just now sought after does not necessitate this however. The present purpose will be accomplished by here pointing out, in barest outline merely, some of the more prominent doctrinal views which, as measured by the witness of Jesus, seem not to our author only, "faithful sayings and worthy of all acceptance."

To begin with, the doctrine of sin may be mentioned, of whose conventional chapters, origin, nature, treatment, Christ recognizes only the last two. Sin in its final issue is self-will, or selfishness, a view that holds every man responsible for his own sin, no matter what his hereditary weaknesses, or his social environment. With this idea of sin corresponds the Gospel teaching of salvation. Salvation comes through the cross of Christ, the cross which Christ commands his disciples to take up daily in following Him. It is the symbol of self-renunciation, and self-sacrifice; these constitute "the unsightly beam which must be set up in the midst of a man's sinful pleasures, and the jagged nails that must pierce his selfish soul." Jesus does not describe His cross as a satisfaction to God, else He had hardly asked His disciples to share it. He always speaks of it as a regeneration of man and therefore disciples must take it up daily while journeying toward Heaven. The method of salvation by magic is, in this view, displaced by a method that is grounded on reason and open to the test of personal experience.

By the side of this reference to the doctrine of sin and salvation may be placed a notice of those of faith and the person of Christ. Faith is the religious faculty and belongs to the human constitution as really and vitally as reason or conscience. Faith has self-sustaining, self-verifying power. It is the sixth sense, the sense of the unseen which detects, recognizes, loves, and trusts the goodness of God as revealed by Christ, in whose character it believes, before whose Deity it bows and worships. Christ's religion from the beginning was life, and its irresistible attraction is not the doctrines or ethics of His system, but

Christ Himself. He is the life-blood of Christianity. In spite of every intellectual difficulty we must believe Jesus to be the Son of God. He has done what no other ever did, and what only God could do. He is God because He discharges a "God-function."

Equally strong is the author's representation of the doctrines of judgment and immortality. These latter words express two of our chief convictions, and, resting in the last issue on pure reason, they sustain the heart of humanity. Judgment will be according to type of character. The conviction can never be crushed out that there must be one place for St. John, who was the friend of Jesus, and another for Judas Iscariot, who was His betrayer; one for St. Paul, the self-sacrificing Apostle, and another for Nero, the selfish persecutor. Heaven and hell hinge not on the arbitrary will of the Almighty, but on personal character. "If one surrender himself to Jesus and is crucified on His cross, there is no sin he will not overcome, no service he will not render, no virtue he will not attain. None that follow Jesus will miss Heaven; none that makes 'the great refusal' will be thrust into Heaven. One is afraid that some will inherit hell and be content."

The doctrine of the relationship between God and man, marked for notice at this point, in addition to those just referred to, is treated in one of the most brilliant and compelling chapters of the entire volume. Instead of attempting in a line or two to convey an idea of its character, it might be better perhaps simply to recommend the study of it in its entirety. It is eminently worth it, and will return abundant compensation. The idea of Divine Fatherhood, which is wholly wanting in psalmists and prophets, is a constant and radiant sense in the consciousness and life of Jesus. He toiled for years to write the truth of the Fatherhood on the minds of the disciples. In terms of the Fatherhood He stated and described with minute and affectionate care the entire circle of religious truth. Fatherhood is a revelation of the final idea of God, and is inclusive of all mankind. "People with dogmatic ends to serve have striven to believe that

Jesus reserved 'Father' for the use of His disciples, but an ingenuous person could hardly make the discovery from the Gospels. In them it is recorded: 'Then spake Jesus to the multitude and the disciples, saying, One is your Father, which is in heaven.' If Jesus did not teach a Fatherhood embracing the race, then He used words to conceal thought, and one despairs of ever understanding our Master. With the single word Father, He defines the relation of man and God, and illuminates theology." The introduction of that word, the author might have added, not only illuminates, but transforms the queen of sciences as hitherto known, in every part.

Barring the interpretation of the cross of Christ, which has been noticed, and which probably to very few will seem adequate or satisfying, the several doctrines now instanced, it is believed, will generally be regarded as a valid representation of the witness given to them by Jesus in the Gospels. And it is believed, moreover, that when read in their elaborated form in the chapters of our book, rather than in such abbreviations of them as above given, they will be found to occupy ground considerably higher than the same doctrines do in systems of thought which are no longer supported by the sanctified reason, and the enlightened Christian consciousness of our day.

From these entirely too meagre observations upon several of the numerous admirable and reassuring features of a really able and inspiring book, we turn now to the consideration of a few particulars in which it appears open to adverse criticism. This seems rather an ungracious task. One's confidence in the method of study proposed by those who, with our author, wish to go back to Christ for the data of theological thought, and one's desire to see that method approve itself to wider adoption in doctrinal effort by results free, as far as possible, from error, may be sufficient excuse however, for one's venturing to point out several peculiarities in the views of Dr. Watson's volume, which seem to reflect the Master's mind, not only imperfectly and inadequately, but erroneously and untruthfully.

Into these deficiencies the author has been led, I take it, by not

adhering strictly or consistently to the wider conception of what "Back to Christ" imports. Correctly understood it means a return to the Christ not simply of the Gospels, but the Christ also of glory. He who in the days of His flesh spoke to His disciples that of which we have a record in the Gospels, continued to witness to Himself and Christianity in the days of the Apostles subsequent to His ascension. He continues, indeed, to do so age after age in the events and experiences of history, in our individual hearts also by the mysterious working of His Holy Spirit, just as really and authoritatively as He did while present on earth in the body. These later teachings are intended to amplify and perfect and confirm the knowledge which the Gospels are designed to impart, and may not be disregarded, in my judgment, by students of theological truth who wish to build upon the broadest foundations of the witness of Christ.

Of this our author is not unaware. "When a minister leads his people in the return to Christ it is well for him," he has said in another of his books, "to avoid two extremes. He must neither go to the Gospels alone for there he is dealing with an earthly Christ, nor to the heavens alone for there he is dealing with an unknown Christ; but to Him who is alive forevermore and Him whom we have in the Gospels. Criticism gives us the historical Christ, and mysticism gives us the spiritual Christ, and both together give us the real Christ." But of this counsel he seems to be losing sight in the practical development of *The Mind of the Master*. Without recognizing, as most readers of this REVIEW probably would do, the Church and the Christian consciousness as important, if not coördinate factors with the Scriptures in our religion, Dr. Watson advances the old view, slightly modified, that "the religion of Protestants is not the Bible in all its parts, but first of all that portion which is its soul—the very words of Jesus."

Limiting his horizon in this way simply to the witness of Jesus as given in the Gospel records, he succeeds indeed, under the power of his strong historical imagination, in making "Christ after the flesh," to live once more most vividly before our eyes.

For those of us, however, who believe, with the Apostle writing to the Corinthians, that it is more important to know "Christ after the spirit," the success achieved is, of course of little significance. For is it not after all faith in the glorified Christ that is needed, rather than belief in the earthly Christ, for both our peace here and our bliss hereafter? "The historical imagination, carried even to its highest power, and suffused with the tenderest feeling," it has been strongly put by one whose words are appropriate here, "is not the same as religious faith and cannot do its work. The Christian religion depends not on what Christ was merely, but on what He is; not simply on what He did, but on what He does. It is not because He lived, but because He lives, that we also have life. It is not because the historical imagination is highly developed, so that we can make the evangelist's pages vivid, and be affected as by a fine scene in a drama, not for this reason, but because we confess with our mouth and believe in our heart that God raised Him from the dead, that we are saved. Faith always has its object here and now, and without faith there is no religion." Our author's avowed one-sided reliance simply upon the witness of the historic Jesus, to the prejudice or neglect of the witness of the glorified Christ, marks to my mind the great weakness of his book and the disclosure of it is perhaps the severest criticism that can be put upon it.

Due to this weakness, there are three views, one pertaining to Scripture, another to Creeds, and a third to the Church, which are insisted on in this volume with some warmth of emphasis, and which, according to my reading of Christ's testimony, are not sustained by it. The view of Scripture referred to draws a wide distinction as regards authority between the Gospels and the other portions of the New Testament. With reference to it, it may be remarked that much of what Dr. Watson says concerning the unique character of Christ's words must find ready acceptance with all. No thoughtful student of the New Testament books can fail to notice a wide difference between the Master and St. Paul, for instance. The voice of God is certainly audible, intelligible, persuasive, in a peculiar sense in the words of Him who

spake as never man spake. What Christ says comes from the full, overflowing depths of divine consciousness itself. Paul speaks through the medium of a human intelligence, aided and illuminated, however, by the Holy Spirit, and of course his words fall with a different sound upon our hearing.

It comes with somewhat of surprise, the stress which Dr. Watson puts upon this difference and the inference he draws from it. According to his pages the distinct sphere to which Jesus limited His teaching was religion, a science dealing not with intellectual conceptions, but with spiritual facts, such as the character of God, the principles of the spiritual life, the discipline of the soul, the development of character, the ageless life. "These are His great themes, upon these He has spoken the last word. Having come to declare the divine will and to reveal the holy and righteous Father, He would hardly omit any truth of first magnitude to be told afterwards by His servants. No one apostle or saint could or did add anything to the original deposit of Christ, however much he might expound or enforce it."

What is to be done with Christ's assurance that he had yet many things to say to His disciples which, at the time of His departure, they were not prepared to receive, but which they were to learn when the Spirit of truth, to lead them into all truth, had come, our author does not pause to inform his readers. He only insists that "it is a question that will have to be settled whether the Epistles are of the same authority for faith as the Gospels," and by implication at least shows that for himself they are not. He compares with "Jesus' Evangel," which is never local, never unintelligible, which is ever calm, convincing, human, Paul's style "at times overwrought by feeling," his illustrations, "some of which are forced," his doctrine, "often rabbinical rather than Christian," his treatment of marriage and asceticism "as lacking in sweetness." But granting all this and even more that might be shown by way of contrast between Jesus and Paul, does that empty Apostolic teaching of divine authority? Must we with the Ritschlian school, whilst accepting Apostolic testimony as to what Jesus said and did, refuse to recognize binding authority in

Apostolic theology, a theology which interprets the truth revealed in the life, death, resurrection and enthronement of Christ, and for which interpretation, the gift of the illuminating Spirit, seems to have been specially designed? The correct answer to be given to this question, it seems to me, is a negative one. The Right Rev. Dr. Satterlee, bishop of Washington, in a sermon before the Church Congress recently held in Richmond, mentioned "Ian Maclaren," among others, as teaching Ritschlian doctrine, animadverting at the same time with some severity upon this Neo-Kantian school as he characterized it. In this view on the relative authority of the Epistles as compared with the Gospels our author certainly seems to lay himself open to the bishop's charge. And, whilst willing to bow in humble and adoring worship before Christ, as the Teacher of Supreme Authority, many will continue, contrary to *The Mind of the Master*, to insist that His authority is vindicated by the Holy Spirit as being present also in words of prophets, psalmists and apostles, and that, to their thinking, the distinction as to authority in different portions of the New Testament made by the author is pressed beyond proper warrant.

The second view, that of the contrast between the Sermon on the Mount and the creeds of the Church, brings to the surface Dr. Watson's extreme revulsion from all dogma. Intimation of this has already been given. The commandment of Christ to acknowledge Him as the only Lord of conscience was suggested, he thinks, by the intolerable bondage of thought into which the religious people of His day had fallen. Just as the scribes, who regarded themselves the dictators of faith and practice, became, through their arrogance, the religious blight of the time of Christ, so scribes of a later age, by the exactions of Creed or Confession, might become a menace to the new religion unless the sole Lordship of Himself should ever have full recognition. Hence Christ's warning.

From this word of Jesus witnessing to Himself our author gathers that "among all the Creeds of Christendom the only one which has the authority of Christ Himself is the Sermon on the

Mount. When one reads the creed which was given by Jesus and the creeds which have been made by Christians, he cannot fail to detect an immense difference, and it does not matter whether he selects the Nicene Creed or the Westminster Confession. They all have a family likeness and a family unlikeness to the Sermon on the Mount. They deal with different subjects, move in a different atmosphere and are constructed on different principles. The creed of Christ demands a pure heart, a forgiving spirit, a helpful hand, a heavenly purpose, an unworldly mind. Christ does not ground Christianity in thinking, but first of all in being, in character. The Creeds have nothing to do with character, do not ask pledges of character, have no place in their constitution for character." And, therefore, so the conclusion runs, they deserve simply to be thrown aside.

Now, whilst much of what is said in drawing this contrast is readily acknowledged as being true, it is, at the same time, believed to be based on a wrong conception of the nature and purpose of a creed, and the author's inference accordingly is invalid. We all know and deplore how fearfully creeds and confessions have been misused, how insufferable the yoke they have been the means of placing on thought and life. Such abuse does not warrant the judgment, however, that they are without authority from Christ, and no longer of use to men. Neither does it follow that the ancient formulas of faith, which so long have been furnishing the substance of truth and the basis of life to the Christian Communion, must now, once for all, be hurled into outer darkness. And it seems certain, moreover, that so long as the Church realizes that her faith rests on the great realities of revelation, central among which is the glorified person of our blessed Saviour, the creeds of the Church sanctified by the use of ages will not be displaced by the "Ethical Creed" suggested by Dr. Watson, even under the cordial endorsement which Theodore F. Seward, the enthusiast for church union, has given to it! "I believe in the Fatherhood of God, the words of Jesus, the clean heart, the service of love, the unworldly life, the Beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow

Christ, to forgive my enemies and to seek after the righteousness of God," is a formula of Christian ethics which, so far as it goes, may be good enough, but by the side of the Apostles' Creed, it must be seen at once, it is lacking in features which belong to the very substance of our faith.

The third view, that having reference to the Church, is, from the standpoint of our churchly Reformed faith, a surprising underestimation of the character and significance of the divine human organism in which Christianity is objectively embodied. *The Mind of the Master* thinks "it has been a calamity that for long Christians paid hardly any attention to the idea of the Kingdom of Jesus on which He was always insisting, and gave their whole mind to the entirely different idea of the Church which Jesus only mentioned once with intention in a passage of immense difficulty. The Kingdom flourishes in every corner of the Gospels, and languishes in the Acts and Epistles, while the Church idea is practically non-existent in Jesus' sermons, but saturates the letters of St. Paul. With all respect to the great Apostle, one may be allowed to express his regret that St. Paul has not said less about the Church and more about the Kingdom. One knows also why the Church has a stronger fascination for the ordinary religious person than the Kingdom—the Church is a visible and exclusive institution which one can manage and use; the Kingdom is a spiritual and inclusive society whose members are selected by natural fitness and which is beyond human control. One must *affirm* this or that to be a member of the Church; one must *be* something to be a part of the Kingdom of God."

This conception of the Church, which we need not stay to discuss at any length, is the outcome of disregarding the witness of the glorified Jesus in the acts and writings of the Apostles whom He had commissioned to disciple all nations, and endued with power from on high to accomplish the work entrusted to them. It ignores likewise the witness of Jesus in the Church of to-day, which, through its ministry, its worship, its sacraments, is surely of significance in the economy of human salvation, and which is

vindicating its divine functions in carrying forward in unbroken continuity the triumphs which Christianity is designed to achieve. And, instead of believing that "the characteristic product of the Church is ecclesiastics," as our book affirms, we believe the product to be saints, in the sense of the Creed—men and women sanctified in body, soul and spirit through vital fellowship with Christ in the communion of which He is the ever-living and glorious head. And, so long as Christ is witnessing through the Church, which is His body, to the truth as it is in Himself and in Christianity, we need not regard it a calamity to place large emphasis upon the Church, for so doing can tend only to the enlarged influence of the kingdom of God and the greater glory of His Christ.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

IV.

HOW CAN WE BEST CULTIVATE A DENOMINATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AMONG OUR PEOPLE?

BY REV. A. B. KOPLIN, D. D.

Recognizing the Reformed Church not as the only valid ecclesiastical organization, but rather only as one of the various branches of the Christian Church, our subject involves an answer to the question: How can we best bring our people to, and establish them in a true recognition of themselves as members of the Reformed Church in contradistinction from other churches, on the one hand; and, as in common with all the people of God, of every name and order, and of all ages and climes, members of the Church Catholic, and as such sharers of the universal brotherhood of Saints, on the other hand? Or, what is the best way to establish our people in an intelligent apprehension and earnest appreciation of their peculiar inheritance as members of the Reformed Church; and how shall we best help them to realize that they can best serve the Great Head of the Church universal, by making faithful use of the means of grace in, and seeking earnestly to promote the best interests of the Reformed Church, as that branch of His Zion, which, under God, is their Spiritual mother and their Christian home?

This is at once an interesting and far-reaching question, the importance of which is not apt to be overestimated. Indeed, it is a theme well worthy of deep study and earnest discussion. And, notwithstanding, it is a theme which is eminently practical in its nature, it is none the less difficult in its full apprehension and clear elucidation.

During the early history of Christianity the principle involved in our subject was much more simple. Now, however, since the Church has developed into various denominations, each with its

own distinctive peculiarities, it has become complex. Then the Christian world was comprehended in one household. Now it is unfolded into many households. Hence as a true world-consciousness is possible only where a normal self-consciousness has been developed in the family and community to which the subject belongs, so can we come to a true knowledge of the common brotherhood of all believers only as we have come to a consciousness of ourselves as living members of the "True Vine" in that congregation and denomination of which we are living members.

Much of that which passes current for a boasted denominationalism amounts to nothing better than downright bigotry and sectism, which will have it that the broad and deep stream of salvation must flow, for all time, within its own narrow, shallow channel, whilst all other branches of the Church are looked upon as just so many synagogues of Satan, or, at best, only as the stagnant eddies along the stream of Christian history; a resuscitation to life of the elements of which, being looked upon as possible only in so far as they allow themselves to be wrenched from their ancient moorings and become identified, here with the *true doctrine*, there with the *true Church*, and there, again, with the elements of vital godliness, falsely so called; and so on down from a stupid, though self-complacent sectism, through a deceitful rationalism to a bald infidelity. With this false denominationalism the great mission seems to be, not to gather within its folds those who are without, but much rather to "cavass sea and land" to make proselytes. And as such it fastens itself, parasite-like, upon the Body Mystical, and, whenever and wherever possible, feeds upon its very life.

And not a whit better nor less harmful is that pretended liberalism, that false catholicity, which sees no distinction between the different branches of the Church, and, not knowing its own identity, is ever ready for any pretended cause, or no cause at all, to pass from one church to another, a veritable vagabondism which tramps from denomination to denomination, as the proletariate tramps from house to house to beg his daily bread.

Thus it is seen that a hyper-denominationalism or sectism, on the one hand, and a non-denominationalism on the other hand, prove themselves to be opposite poles only of the same evil; which, whilst it pretends to promote the cause of truth and righteousness is, after all, only seeking its own personal and selfish ends. And it is the same evil spirit which manifests itself only too often, between adjacent congregations of the same denomination, when each would build his house higher than his neighbor's, even though it should be of material either unjustly obtained, or actually purloined. Thus, instead of furthering the cause of religion, both play into the hands of the common enemy, and bring disgrace and shame upon the cause they profess to serve.

That is the true denominational spirit which enables the professing Christian fully to appreciate his blessed heritage, in that branch of the Church to which he rightfully belongs, and which prompts him earnestly to devote his energies to its usefulness and prosperity, whilst it enables him, at the same time, also, keenly to realize and deplore whatever imperfections and defects may yet mar the beauty and strength of his spiritual mother; and urges him ever to put forth his best efforts to improve her condition until her "righteousness shall shine forth clear as the moon, and bright as the noon-day sun." And if, under the providence of God, it should be his privilege to belong to that branch of the Church which may prove to be superior to other churches, in genius and history, creed and cultus, he may well glory in his good fortune, but he must take good heed that he may ever be far from disparaging those less favored. And wherever the Gospel is truly preached, the sacraments rightly administered and the power of the keys lawfully exercised, there he must recognize the existence of a branch of the true Church; and must ever feel an interest in its legitimate prosperity. And so also must he ever pray and labor that all who call themselves Christians may be united in the bonds of a holy faith as one body, "that there may be one flock even as there is one Shepherd." This we conceive to be the true denominational spirit which should characterize every member of the Body Mystical.

And now, what must we as a Church do to bring our people to a full consciousness of this feature of the Christian life? And how shall we establish them in this consciousness, so as to give proper tone to their Christian character and activity? This is the important question which calls for an answer in this paper. In dealing with our subject we have elected to speak by parable, saying:

The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a prudent, wise and loving mother, who, after having given birth to her children, now, as she feeds their physical life upon her loving breast, neglects not to nourish their souls also with the food of the spirit; but by the loving and life-giving intelligence of her own higher life, which beams in upon them through a mother's loving eye, and penetrates them through her cheering voice, she quickens into life the powers of their souls, and brings them to that consciousness of self, and of that world of which they constitute a part, which must find its goal in a consciousness of God as the Father of all.

And, should it be asked, what is the interpretation of this parable? The answer must be this: The mother is the Church, who is the Bride, the Lamb's wife; and as such the bearer of His life and grace to dying men, who through the "laver of regeneration and washing away of sin," giveth the birth of the Spirit to all who are brought to the font in the faith of the Triune God, and who feedeth them upon the sincere milk of the word, and bringeth them to a knowledge of the adoption of God as His dear children; whilst she guardeth them with a strong arm and jealous care against all the evil of sin and corruption, and guideth them by an unerring council, in the way of righteousness and life, and bringeth them unto the full stature of man and womanhood in Christ Jesus our Lord. Thus doth our Spiritual mother bring her faithful children to a knowledge of themselves as loyal citizens of the Israel of God, and as such, in common with all His people, heirs of the heritage of love and eternal life, which He hath given to His saints.

In training her children the true mother does not seek to cultivate in them a filial regard by depreciating her fellow mothers

and their families because of any real or imaginary inferiority which may mar their beauty or modify their standing in the domain of motherhood. On the contrary, she is actuated by an earnest desire, augmented from first to last, by that self-sacrificing love and undying devotion which only a Christian mother can have for her offspring, to prepare her children for a useful and happy life. To reach this end she breathes into them from her warm and loving heart, the spirit of love, which in turn receives its rightful response in their growing and grateful submission and willing obedience to her rightful authority. She fondles and feeds, clothes and adorns them, and in every way supplies their many wants, always from a self-rewarding love. She teaches them, by word and example, the lessons of the love of righteousness, virtue and purity of life, and habits of industry and economy, as well. And as touching their relations to their fellow man, she instills that principle which makes us kin to all our race, and as such lies at the foundation of all social relations and obligations, namely: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them, likewise." And above all, she "brings up her children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, that when they are old, they may not depart therefrom."

And surely that mother who thus brings up her children never needs to fear, though there may be ten thousand mothers who may be in every way her superiors, that she will ever be disowned or forgotten by her children, whilst she has every reason to hope that they will prove a blessing to their race, and will bring lasting honor upon her memory.

So also with the Church. That denomination which would bring her members to a recognition of herself as their spiritual mother, and would establish them in her embrace as their proper ecclesiastical home, in whose bosom they are to enjoy all the comforts of the religion of Christ, and if she would assure them that, in promoting her interests, they can best enhance the cause of our holy religion, and, with the residue of God's people, finally attain to a glorious reward, she must not feel it to be her mission to berate or bite and devour her sister churches. Much rather

must she prove her motherhood by bringing her members to a conscious realization of themselves as in and through her, living members of that one holy catholic Church of Christ, which the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends and preserves to Himself, by His Word and Spirit, and that as such they are, in common with all the people of God, chosen to everlasting life.

To accomplish this glorious end, the denominations of the Church must see to it that they establish their people in the faith once committed to the saints; and they must lovingly, promptly, constantly and fully supply all their wants, and bring them to enjoy all the blessings of grace. And no less must they see to it that proper opportunity and inspiring encouragement be at all times given to their members to exercise their gifts, thus enabling them at once to develop an active Christian life, and have full part also with the members of other churches in the work of the evangelization of the world and the salvation of men.

That denomination of the Church which will bestow upon her people an inheritance at once so grand and glorious, so inspiring and soul-satisfying, will have the consciousness of knowing that she hath done what she could; and will ever have good reason to hope that she may marshal her forces with ever increasing numbers, who are always ready to go forth in the strength of the Lord and do battle against the common enemy of God and man.

From these general considerations we draw the following conclusions:

First. If we, as a church, would cultivate a true denominational consciousness among our people, we must bring them to fully realize that the Reformed Church is a living branch of the Church Universal, and that, therefore, all her faithful members are incorporate in the Body Mystical.

Second. We must bring our people to stand consciously and firmly in the true faith; holding to the Holy Scriptures as being the inspired Word of God; the Apostles' Creed as a summary of the true expression of the foundation articles of the Christian

Faith; and the Heidelberg Catechism, as a system of doctrines which flow from the Bible in the sense of the Apostles' Creed.

Third. That we impress upon our people the biblical and historical right of the Reformed Church to exist as a distinct branch of the Christian Church, which, therefore, has full authority, in God's name to demand of her members a willing obedience to all the requirements of the Gospel.

Fourth. That we fully acquaint our people with the history of our Church, as being preëminently the Church of the martyrs.

Fifth. That we impress our people ever more and more with the important fact that the Reformed Church recognizes no human hero, nor theory of the schools around which to marshal her hosts; but that she is planted firmly upon the broad and deep foundation of a Christological theology; and that she holds with an unflinching faith and undying love to the once crucified, but now risen and gloriously exalted, yet ever present Christ, as her only Lord and Master, whom she serves with ever growing zeal and delight. And, therefore, we must bring our people to realize that we, as a Church, can rally our forces only in so far as they are permeated with the life and spirit of our blessed Master.

Sixth. We must bring our people to a full knowledge of the central position which the Reformed Church occupies on account of her irenical spirit, her living theology, her churchly character and her broad catholicity.

Seventh. That we inform our people of the ample equipment of the Reformed Church, in every way, to have full part with our sister churches in the great work of the conversion of the world.

Eighth. That we ever solemnly challenge our people to take full part in all the services of the sanctuary and in all Christian work.

Ninth. That we teach our people to regard other churches with a becoming Christian kindness and courtesy; and that they earnestly pray the Great Head of the Church, in His goodness to hasten the day, when there shall be one Flock, even as there is "one Lord, one Faith and one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."

V.

PESTALOZZI, THE SWISS EDUCATIONAL
REFORMER.

NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER.

John Henry Pestalozzi, the famous Swiss teacher whose influence as an educator has been felt the world over, was a member of the Reformed Church, and as such his career is of peculiar interest to the members of the same denomination in America. He was born at Zurich on January 12, 1746. His father was a surgeon, whose ancestors had migrated from Italy in the period of the Reformation to escape religious persecution. The death of the father left the boy at the age of six, in the care of his mother and a female servant by the name of Babeli. In many respects he grew up like a spoilt darling. It was necessary for the mother to practice the most rigid economy in bringing up her three children. To keep him from tearing his clothes he was kept in the house, away from other playmates. "From one year to another," says he, "I never left the domestic hearth; in short all the essential means and inducements to the development of manly vigor, manly experience, manly ways of thinking and manly exercises, were just as much wanting to me, as from the peculiarity and weakness of my temperament I specially needed them. I saw the world only within the narrow limits of my mother's parlor, and within the equally narrow limits of my schoolroom; to real human life I was almost as great a stranger as if I did not live in the world in which I dwelt."

This sort of training would have made most children shy and timid, or selfish and self-willed. Owing to his peculiar temperament it made him queer, dreamy and apt to follow a dominating idea to the exclusion of all other ideas, and utterly regardless of his environment. Clumsy and awkward, good-natured and oblig-

ing, he became the victim of the jokes at school and developed a disposition which made him ready at all times to take up the cause of the unfortunate and the suffering. When he saw the rich man's children receiving better treatment at school than the sons and daughters of poor parents, it stirred up within him a feeling of righteous indignation. From his ninth year he was permitted to spend a part of his time with his maternal grandfather, who was the pastor of a village about three miles from Zurich. The grandfather's piety made a deep impression upon his heart, and to the end of his life daily prayer was a necessity to his soul. Here he also saw the yoke of oppression which rested upon the necks of the rural population. At fifteen he joined a society (of which Lavater was the head), whose members leagued themselves against all oppressors of the people. The league brought the charge of injustice against Grebel, the governor of the canton, impeached the character of Brunner, the mayor of Zurich, and made war upon unworthy clergymen.

It is not surprising that a youth growing up under these influences should be deeply stirred by Rousseau's *Emile*. "The moment Rousseau's *Emile* appeared," says he, "my visionary and highly speculative mind was enthusiastically seized by this visionary and highly speculative book. I compared the education which I enjoyed in the corner of my mother's parlor and also in the school which I frequented, with what Rousseau demanded for the education of his *Emile*. The home, as well as the public education of the whole world and of all ranks of society, appeared to me as altogether a crippled thing, which has to find a universal remedy for its present pitiful condition in Rousseau's lofty ideas. The ideal system of liberty, also, to which Rousseau imparted fresh animation, increased in me the visionary desire for a more extended sphere of activity, in which I might promote the welfare and happiness of the people. Juvenile ideas as to what it was necessary and possible to do in this respect in my native town, induced me to abandon the clerical profession, to which I had formerly leaned and for which I had been destined, and caused the thought to spring up within me, that it might be pos-

sible, by the study of the law, to find a career that would be likely to procure for me, sooner or later, the opportunity and means of exercising an active influence on the civil condition of my native town and even of my native land."

While living with his grandfather he conceived a strong affection for country people. The complaint of the country clergy, *omne malum ex urbe*—all evil comes from the city—left its impression upon his soul. A fierce hatred toward the aristocracy, who oppressed the rural population, was kindled in his heart, and continued to burn within him along with love of the people; it characterizes him in his youth as well as in old age, and is visible in most of his writings.

Sickness caused him to abandon his legal and historical studies. His physician advised him to seek health in the country. Under the influence of Rousseau's diatribes against scientific study, he abandoned his books, burnt his manuscripts and visited Tschiffeli, a farmer of reputation in the Canton of Bern. From Tschiffeli's plantations of Madder, he conceived the idea of making a similar experiment near the village of Birr, where he purchased for ten florins about one hundred acres of barren, chalky, heath-land, which had been used as a sheep walk. The erection of a dwelling house in Italian style upon this tract, he afterwards regarded as an imprudent step. He named it Neuhof. In this enterprise he associated himself with a mercantile firm of Zurich. The members of this firm withdrew their support when they found him lacking in the essentials of success as an agriculturist.

In another direction he met with more success. At the age of seven he got a few coins which he determined to spend in a confectionery store. The girl behind the counter, instead of selling him what he wanted, gave him the advice not to spend his money so foolishly. At the age of twenty-four he offered this same girl his hand in marriage. She was seven years older or about 31. The tongue of modern gossip would have said that he married her for her money and that she accepted him as her last chance. Their subsequent life showed that it was a union brought about

by more worthy motives. With her money the two might have lived in ease and luxury. But when he looked about him, he saw the rich in the enjoyment of all which the heart could wish for. The poor, on the other hand, were grovelling in rags and filth and dirt. They were not living; they were only existing. His heart, which always beat high for humanity, led him to conceive the idea that he might gather the children of the poor at Neuhof, and give them an industrial education. The readiness with which his wife sacrificed her wealth to further his schemes, the devotion with which they clung to each other in the midst of misfortune, and the words which he uttered after she lay a corpse, show that the match was a love match in the best sense of the word. Without doubt she had much to complain of by reason of his lack of tact and business capacity. In the very year in which the New World struck the first blow for liberty, he made his first move against the ignorance of the masses. Before the end of 1775 he had fifty children under his care at Neuhof. In addition to the ordinary instruction in which he made experiments after his own kind, he taught them farm work in summer and some handicraft in winter. This attempt at industrial education failed because the mothers begged and received pay for their children, whilst the children who were unaccustomed to steady employment and found a regular life irksome, often ran away as soon as they were dressed in Sunday clothes. The help which came to him from those who were in sympathy with his experiment, only served to postpone his second financial failure. After five years of gradual loss and endless worry he was obliged to close his school.

Poverty is sometimes a condition of success. He had failed in his attempt to create a model farm as well as in his endeavor to better the condition of the poor by a new education. In what direction should he next try to realize his ideal? The only avenue now open to him is to send forth his ideas and to give vent to his aspirations through the pen. In 1780 he wrote "*The Evening Hours of Hermit*," a series of aphorisms which were printed in Iselin's *Ephemerides*. Karl Schmid says that they

contain the key to Pestalozzi's pedagogic activity, and likens them unto grains of gold in capsules of silver. Rauner characterizes them as concise and thought-teeming aphorisms forming a beautiful and ingenious whole, and calls attention to the points of agreement and of difference between him and Rousseau. "Like Pestalozzi, Rousseau requires real knowledge and trained skill in the business of life, not an empty display of words, without an insight into the things themselves, and a ready power of acting. Like Pestalozzi, Rousseau ridicules the plan of giving a discursive knowledge about things remote, and leaving them in ignorance of the things in their immediate vicinity. He requires, like Pestalozzi, that they should be first at home in this vicinity. In this manner many other things might be pointed out in which both men agree, arising principally from their common aversion to a baseless, dead talkativeness, without any real intelligence, activity of mind or readiness of action. But when viewed more closely, how immensely different are the two men in all that is most essential. Rousseau will not have God named before children, he is of opinion that long physical and metaphysical study is necessary to enable us to think of God. With Pestalozzi God is the nearest, the most intimate being to man, the alpha and omega of his whole life. Rousseau's God is no paternal God of love, his Emile no child of God. The man who put his children into a foundling hospital, knew nothing of paternal and filial love; still less of rulers as the fathers of nations, and of the child-like obedience of subjects; his ideal was a cold, heartless freedom, which was not based on love, but was defensive, isolating, and altogether selfish. While, according to Pestalozzi, the belief in God penetrates, strengthens, attunes, sanctifies all the relations of men; while the relation between ruler and subjects, between father and children, and the paternal love of God to his children, men, are everywhere reflected in his paper—with Rousseau there is never any mention of such bonds of love."

His fame as an educator was secured by his Leonard and Gertrude. It appeared in the year in which Cornwallis surrendered

at Yorktown, and caused more stir in Europe than the closing event of the American revolution. Two brothers by the name of Füseli were discussing the fate of the philanthropic dreamer at Neuhof. One of them, an artist by profession, pointing to something from Pestalozzi's pen, asked, "Who did that," and on being told the author's name, exclaimed: "The man has talent and might help himself by writing." The other brother, who was a bookseller, urged him to ply his pen. After attempting some tales in imitation of Marmontel, without much success, he touched upon domestic education and, drawing upon his own experience, he found it growing beyond his most sanguine expectations. Like so many works of genius, it was almost a spontaneous creation. "The history of Leonard and Gertrude," says he, "flowed from my pen I know not how, and developed itself of its own accord, without my having the slightest plan in my head, and even without my thinking of one. In a few weeks the book stood there, without my knowing exactly how I had done it. I felt its value, but only as a man in his sleep feels the value of some piece of good fortune of which he is just dreaming." It is a tale in which Gertrude, the wife of Leonard, a good natured but weak man, is the teacher of her own child. The neighbors seeing her skill, ask that their children may be admitted. The village pastor, whose preaching had been dull and lifeless, visits the school; his heart is touched and his preaching is transformed. The bailiff who sells the beer and then fines the peasants for quarreling after they are intoxicated, finally becomes a changed man. He closes the saloon and the village, in which everything was going from bad to worse, is renewed in its life. The manner in which Gertrude keeps house and trains and instructs children, is Pestalozzi's ideal. The book is full of love for the common people. It is an appeal for the uplifting of the masses through the school and the home.

While its author was struggling for bread, it went in triumph over Europe, everywhere stirring up an interest in popular education. The newspapers praised it; the almanacs were full of it; the agricultural society of Bern awarded him their great gold

medal with a letter of thanks. Fichte referred to it in his lectures at Berlin as indicating the way for restoring the prosperity of the fatherland. At Königsburg a woman of royal rank has just finished the book and writes in her diary: "To-day I was reading a book for the people by J. H. Pestalozzi. One feels at home in the Swiss village which he describes. If I had my own way I would step into my carriage, roll off to Switzerland in order with tears in my eyes and with the warm pressure of my hand, to thank the man for what he has done for the people." It was the wife of Frederick William III., of Prussia, and she persuaded her husband to send seventeen young men to Switzerland to study at Pestalozzi's Normal School at Yverdun, and when these returned and introduced their reforms into Prussia, she visited the schools, studied their methods and followed them in the training of her own children. For half a century Prussia was called the land of schoolmasters. When the war of 1866 broke out, many predicted a downfall for Prussia as great as in the days of the first Napoleon. Soon the astonishing news came that, after seven days fighting, Austria lay powerless at the feet of the king whose mother had wept over a book on education. The newspapers said it was the needle gun that did it. A few years passed and the war with France broke out. This time the best guns were not on the side of the Prussians. In seven months Napoleon III. had lost his crown, haughty Paris lay at the mercy of the German armies; five thousand million francs were paid to indemnify the German nation for the expenses of the war and the son of Louise was proclaimed as William I., Emperor of Germany. The world saw and acknowledged that the schoolmaster had conquered, and that the principles of Pestalozzi had borne their fruit in making Prussia the strongest kingdom of Germany and united Germany the strongest empire in Europe. Through Pestalozzi Prussia became the land of schools, and through Prussia's example and influence Pestalozzi moulded the civilized world in favor of popular education.

In the preface to the second edition of *Leonard and Gertrude*, Pestalozzi gives as the object of the book, the bringing about

of a better popular education, based upon the true condition of the people and their natural relations. It contained his message to the poor and destitute, to the hearts of those who stand over them in God's stead. It was his first word to the mothers of the land and to the heart which God has given them, to be unto their children what no one else on earth can be in their stead.

The eighteen years, from 1780 to 1798, which Pestalozzi spent at Neuhof after the failure of his experiment in industrial education, remind one of the eighteen years which the Great Teacher spent at Nazareth after His visit to the temple at Jerusalem had caused the doctors to marvel at His wisdom and understanding. Years of thought and of work with the pen were needed to clarify Pestalozzi's views on education after he became conscious of his mission as an educational reformer. During these years he engaged in no educational enterprise, but spent the time in making books and in editing a Swiss journal. His writings during this time were mainly of a philosophical and political character, and relate only indirectly to education. But with the progress of the French Revolution, old forms were doomed to pass away. The French armies entered Switzerland, set up, after the model of their own republic, a government with five directors, among whom was Legrand, a friend of Pestalozzi. When he continued to urge order, justice and law upon the new government, he was tendered an appointment in the hope of keeping him quiet. In reply to their inquiry as to what office he would accept, he said: "I will be a schoolmaster." The idea pleased Legrand. A Capuchin had persuaded the Catholic population of Unterwalden to believe that the new government was the work of Satan. To crush the rebellion a force of 12,000 French marched into the canton, and on September 9, 1798, burned Stanz in Unterwalden; the entire canton was laid waste, and many orphans were left destitute and without shelter. Pestalozzi was invited to take charge of them in a convent of the Ursulines. Eighty neglected children, infected with the itch and scurvy, and covered with vermin, not one in ten knowing so much as the alphabet, were entrusted to his care. He sought to combine intellectual

education with manual training. For want of assistants, he selected some of the children to instruct others, a plan which afterwards made Lancaster famous in three continents. "My aim," says he, "was to carry the simplification of the means of teaching so far that all the common people might easily be brought to teach their children, and gradually to render the schools almost superfluous for the first elements of instruction." The mother, according to his scheme, was to supplant the teacher; the home was to fill the place of the elementary school. Seeking to take the place of the parent to his orphan children, he acted as teacher, paymaster, manservant and even housemaid. The arrival of French troops, who were hard pressed by the Austrians, broke up the school; the wings of the convent were converted into a hospital; the few children who remained were placed in the care of others; and days of rest restored Pestalozzi's failing health. He next became an assistant in the school at Burgdorf, in the Canton of Bern, where the jealousy of the headmaster, the report that he was not using the Heidelberg catechism and the rumor that he could not write or cipher or even read well (the last accusation he admitted to be true) caused him many enemies. A committee of investigation reported that his pupils made extraordinary progress and that he had shown what power can be developed by efficient teaching. A pulmonary trouble, however, made him give up the position before a year had passed. The arrival of Krüsi, who came from Appenzell to Burgdorf for the purpose of opening a seminary for the training of teachers, opened a new epoch for Pestalozzi. Although the plan was not carried out by reason of the death of Fischer, the Swiss minister of education, Krüsi and Pestalozzi learned to esteem each other, and the two opened a private school in the Castle of Burgdorf. Four years they labored together in this school; other teachers joined them in the enterprise. During these four years he published a book, entitled "How Gertrude Teaches Her Children," and went as a Swiss deputy to Paris, where he hoped to plead for the children in the presence of Napoleon Bonaparte. Instead of an interview he received the reply that Napoleon had no time

to waste on A B C's. Conscious of the lofty purposes which animated his soul, he afterwards said: "I did not see Napoleon, nor did he see me." What a contrast between the subsequent history of the people whose emperor had no time to waste on the alphabet and the people whose queen wept over a book on education!

In 1803 the personnel of the Bernese government changed; the school was deprived of its home in the castle. Among the buildings which were offered to him for school purposes, he selected the castle at Yverdun (sometimes spelled Yverdon and in German Ifferten, the ancient name was Ebrodunum) on the southern extremity of a Swiss lake. Here he conducted his school from 1804 to 1825, and drew to himself world-wide attention. Pupils came from foreign lands, and teachers like Froebel visited him to study his methods and to enjoy the tonic atmosphere of his normal school. A gentleman came all the way from Sweden to consult him about the education of his sons. An Irish gentleman who was persuaded to visit the school, remained several months. The Czar Alexander bestowed upon him the order of Wladimir, and the authorities in Spain made him a Grandee, that is a nobleman of the first rank who may be covered in the King's presence. Two hundred persons could be accommodated in the castle and between fifty and sixty dwelt in the town. The arrival of pupils from foreign lands gradually undermined the discipline, he lacked the executive ability to master the new conditions which the presence of rich men's sons imposes upon an educational institution. Moreover his teachers quarreled. He lacked practical tact in the management of men; he was not enough of a leader to make subordinates of diverse talents and temperament work in harmony and in obedience to his will. Moreover a grandson who had no tact either as a teacher or a disciplinarian helped to bring the institution into disrepute. The sums which he realized from the publication of an edition of all his works, did not suffice to save the institution from ultimate ruin. It would be tedious to follow the quarrels between his teachers and the misfortunes which befell the institu-

tion. For two years he survived its downfall, lamenting his mistakes and planning a new institution. On February 17, 1827, death released him from his sorrows and regrets. "He seemed to be smiling at the angel who came to fetch him," said those standing around his death bed. "I wish," said he, "to be buried under the eaves of the school and that my name alone should be engraved on the stone which covers me; when the drops of water have made a hole in the stone, the people will perhaps be more just to my memory than they have been to myself during life."

The prediction has been verified. Seventy years have elapsed since his death. His ideas are a living power in every school throughout the world, and he himself is awakening fresh interest every day. Reserving the consideration of his theories and his method for a future article, let us turn to a spectacle witnessed at Yverdon, on July 5, 1890. Amid choruses of rejoicing and garlands of flowers, the children are singing: "Glory to Pestalozzi, glory to the friend of children." Bells are ringing, bands are playing, speeches are made. Then the statue by the Swiss artist, Alfred Lanz, which was on view at the Paris exhibition, is unveiled. It represents Pestalozzi as standing. "With one arm he encircles a little girl. On the other side a bare-legged boy holding a book looks up into his benefactor's face with confidence and affection. The wonderful expression of fatherly love and benevolence which gave Pestalozzi's rugged face a beauty all its own, is there, and we hear him saying, as he often said to his adopted children, 'And you too mean to be wise and good, do you not?' On the base are inscribed the words from his epitaph at Birr, 'Benefactor of the poor at Neuhof, Father of the orphans at Stanz, Founder of the National School at Burgdorf, Educator of the people at Yverdon. Everything for others—for myself nothing.' On the other side are his own immortal words: 'I lived like a beggar to teach beggars to live like men.'"

VI.

SERMONIZING.

BY A. E. TRUXAL, D. D.

Individuality is just as prevalent and pronounced in the ministry as anywhere else. Men differ from each other in the natural constitution of their mind, disposition and temperament. Individualism is not destroyed by education, but developed and, in some respects, made to stand out all the more definitely. Still it must also be admitted that education and culture bring out too those powers of the individual which he possesses in common with all men. But while men are in a sense brought together on a common level by general education, and by the study and practice of the same kind of knowledge come to know the same things in the same general way, yet the individuality of each still remains throughout it all.

While ministers of the Gospel, therefore, are all supposed to be educated men and to have studied theology in all its branches, yet, because of their various constitutions and natural endowments and because of the different ways and modes by which their minds work, and the various degrees in which they apply themselves, it necessarily follows that they will pursue different courses and plans in the preparation of their sermons. Consequently it would be a vain task for any one to formulate a detailed system of rules and regulations for the government, and guidance even, of all ministers in the matter of sermonizing. All that can be done in the case is to lay down some general principles that ought to exert a controlling and governing influence with the preacher in the preparation of his sermons.

Any minister who slavishly follows in his sermonizing the plan or mode of another, gradually weakens his own inherent powers. He who wishes to develop and assert his own strength and be

effective in his efforts must work out his sermons in his own way. The study of other men's sermons and of sermon outlines, if judiciously prosecuted and pursued to a limited extent, may be beneficial to any one; but the minister ought, by no means, depend on others to do his thinking for him, or to work out for him the message which he is to bring from the Word of God to his hearers. Every preacher ought to discover the truth of the Gospel and reveal it to the people in his own way and manner. This, indeed, is the solemn and weighty responsibility laid on him by his calling.

The popularity of homiletic commentaries, books and magazines does not seem to argue very much in favor of the independence and mental vigor of the ministry of the present day. Helps are a good thing only when they lead the person to arrive speedily at such a condition that he can help himself. Crutches are a necessity sometimes, but if the person will not in due time cast them aside he will remain lame and weak to the end. The first general rule then to be laid down for the preacher is that he shall not rely on homiletic helps in the preparations of his sermons. When he sits down to formulate his sermon he ought to work it out from his own heart and with his own mind and in his own way, otherwise his message will not carry with it the desired and required convincing, comforting and upbuilding force to the minds and hearts of his hearers.

Again, the minister is to preach the Word. The holy Scriptures are to furnish him with subjects to be developed and elucidated for the spiritual benefit of his congregation. The Bible is the fountal source whence he must obtain the Divine truth to be presented to the people and impressed upon their hearts.

This demands of him that he know what the Bible is, what it contains and what its contents mean for man and the world in all ages. In other words, he is required to possess a thorough knowledge of theology in all its branches. He needs a knowledge of biblical, exegetical, historical, systematic and practical theology. He is supposed to have acquired a general knowledge of these

branches in the schools previous to his entrance upon the official work of the ministry. But this is not sufficient, and the young minister makes the greatest possible mistake when he imagines that his education in this line has been finished when he has passed through the curricula of the schools. He needs to study theology during his entire life in the ministry. The Bible must be studied and restudied by him. He needs to search the Scriptures in the light of new works on theology that are published from time to time. The minister must be a live theologian if he wishes his preaching to be fresh and efficient. A ministry lacking in theological knowledge must ever be a weak ministry.

This does, however, not require that the minister of the Gospel shall preach theology pure and simple, that his sermons are to be theological discourses, but it requires that he shall know something about the Word of God before he undertakes to preach sermons from it to the people. This theological knowledge will give tone, strength and virility to his sermons. It will furnish a solid and substantial foundation for his discourses, though they treat of the most practical affairs of faith and life. One of the essential matters, therefore, in the preparation of sermons, is that the minister never cease to read and study works on theology and on kindred subjects.

Again, the preacher ought to have a knowledge of the people whom he is to address. He ought to know man. He ought to understand the nature of man. He ought to have an apprehension of the laws that rule in man's mental and moral nature, and he ought to have a correct and clear knowledge of the spiritual and moral condition of those to whom he is to preach. The truth of the Gospel is indeed objective and of general application; and some sermons may be of such a common character as to apply to all men everywhere equally well; but it is a question whether that kind of sermons are productive of the best results. The preaching of the Gospel is done mainly by pastors to their own congregations. And to accomplish the end of preaching pastors must know their people, know their condition and needs. And by their sermons then they must apply the truth of God to the particular requirements of their hearers.

The writer in the early years of his ministry was intimately associated with a brother minister of his own church whom he, on several occasions, solicited for a subject on which to preach the coming Lord's Day. The answer given each time in a semi-humorous way was, "preach the Gospel in its relation to man." That of course was a very general direction, yet it contains a very important truth. The Gospel is related to man in general, and it is related to the individual too. The preacher must present it in its relation to his congregation at the time. In preparing his sermons the minister ought to know the Word of God and the needs of the people, and apply the former to the latter.

How shall the minister secure texts and themes for his sermons? These are secured in different ways by different ministers. In regard to this matter we make the following suggestions: 1. Keeping in mind always the surroundings and condition of his people, the minister in his general reading and in the study of works on theology and Christian ethics will discover various themes to be developed in his sermons. 2. In reading the Bible from day to day, he will be specially impressed every now and then with the significance and importance of a Scripture truth, that would be beneficial and edifying to his people. 3. His experience and observation in pastoral work will discover to him numerous phases of faith and morals in regard to which the people need enlightenment. 4. If he follows the church year (which we believe every minister ought to do), the Gospel and Epistle lessons will furnish new truth each year to be developed and illustrated for the benefit of his congregation. It will, of course, be readily understood that if these various sources are to furnish the minister with texts and subjects for sermons, he must be attentive, observing and diligent in prosecuting the work of his calling. He must keep his eyes open, his mind open and his heart open in order that he may apprehend the things that are revealed to him on all sides.

In our opinion, then, it does not matter much what course the minister pursues in the formulation of his sermon. Each one ought to follow that plan for which he knows himself to be best

qualified. With his mind and heart filled up and distended with the truth of his subject and with a clear conception of the condition and needs of the people let him set to work to develop, illustrate and apply his theme in his own way, and he will produce a good and edifying sermon. The rule, however, ought to be that he first of all come to a thorough understanding of the meaning of his text as this appears in the light of its context, circumstances, occasion and authorship; then let that meaning be developed so that his hearers will be able to see it clearly and apply it to themselves. The truth underlying the words of his Scripture ought to furnish the theme for him. May he not obtain his theme first and then seek a text to suit it? Occasionally he is justifiable in doing so. He may feel himself challenged to preach on Foreign Missions, or on Home Missions or on Christian Education, or on some historical subject, or on some other theme. Then it becomes his privilege and duty to seek a Scripture text suitable to the subject and the occasion. But such sermons ought to be the exception. The rule ought to be, first the text, then the theme and lastly the sermon.

Shall the preacher write his sermon? Yes, as a rule, he ought to do so. There are very few ministers who can think out and prepare a sermon properly and thoroughly without writing. He who undertakes to prepare several sermons and an address or two each week without writing a good deal is very apt to become general and commonplace in his public deliverances. The minister ought to write his sermons, but he does not necessarily need to use his manuscript in the pulpit. Yet we could not advise him to commit his sermon to memory. That is a slavish practice, and in the end works injury to the preacher's powers. But he ought to study his written sermon thoroughly so that he knows what it contains; and then preach it with or without notes. We see no objection to his having the manuscript in the pulpit and preaching from it, but he must preach it, not simply read it. He must allow the subject to take hold of him and inspire him as he delivers the sermon to the people.

We believe this subject to be worthy of the consideration and

study of the ministry. Pedagogy is one of the highest sciences and arts. Teaching is both a science and an art, and what is of greater importance than the teaching of the people? It is of great importance to understand how to make known the truth and how to lead others to grasp it. And, in addition to knowing how this is to be done, the teacher must also have acquired proficiency in accomplishing the end in view. Such knowledge is not obtained without study and practice. He must put forth efforts to understand the art of teaching. If he prosecutes his work at random he will not likely produce the best results.

The preacher is a teacher and, to be successful, he must know how to reveal the truth and how to inspire his hearers to seek and apprehend it. He has no right to say that he will preach in any manner that suits him and leave the results with the Lord. It is his duty to sermonize and preach intelligently. He must study sermonizing and preaching, and then practice the principles he has discovered with the view of accomplishing the desired results in the minds and hearts of his hearers. Only in this way will he be able to give a good account of his stewardship to the Master.

VII.

THE LIFE OF SOCIALISM.

BY REV. A. G. GEKELER.

Among the questions, in which this Nineteenth Century is so rich, it would be hard to name one of greater importance than the general question of Socialism. It has long been and may perhaps long continue to be a burning question. A theory of society, a scheme for the regeneration and reconstitution of society on rational principles, it has been decried as visionary and utopian, as wicked and unnatural—in short all that is bad in thought and evil in morals. Yet it is the great question which our century will probably hand down to its successors for solution, a question which humanity will not allow to remain unsolved. It may prove, too, to be a question of such far reaching consequences, affecting human life on so many sides and with such power, that the prestige and influence of the Christian Church may largely depend upon Christians occupying a position of undoubted justice, and showing a spirit of fairness, that cannot be gainsaid. In the past the weight of the Church's influence has so often been felt as a conservator of wrong, an ally of tyranny and injustice, that we may well hesitate to prophecy where the leaders of God's people will take their stand.

Some there may be, who deny that there is such a thing as the social question. And the denial may come from the most opposite sources. A Christian may say: "This spirit of discontent and murmuring against the circumstances and conditions of life is all wrong. We all fare better than we deserve. There have always been high and low, rich and poor, and it is rebellion against the divine order of things to wish it otherwise. This dissatisfaction on the part of the lower classes is wicked, and has its roots in the love of the world, in the lust of the flesh and the

pride of life. Murmuring springs from a worldly mind and a corrupt heart; the remedy is in true, heart-regenerating religion." Now it is no doubt true that we come naked into the world, and naked we depart; yet if we would make this fact a reason for indifference toward the practical working of our social organization, it is likely that a great many might remain quite sansculotte while in the world, also. From a very different standpoint on the other hand, we may hear: "Society is under the rule of natural law, and by it men are lifted up or cast down, impoverished or enriched. The attempt largely to better the condition of the masses is futile. The deserving will rise by their own force and worth; the undeserving ought not to rise, and if raised will but drop back through the weight of their follies and vices. Let natural law have its perfect work, it is effectual to reward the worthy and to destroy the unfit, and on the whole it works out a natural justice."

It is, however, often forgotten that men are largely under positive law and customs having the force of positive law. And these laws and customs act like natural law in society. Human law and custom were powerful economic factors in the polity of Israel and Sparta. And in Judea, at least, the only social question was to secure obedience to the laws and customs of the land. It was law and custom, for example, among ancient Germans, that private property in land was forbidden, and that the citizen could hold his allotment but for a year. Under such conditions the accumulation of riches by agriculture was of course impossible, men were but slightly attached to localities and ever ready to engage in predatory raids. To those Germans their comparative poverty, the common equality of the tribesmen, the necessity of war and of frequent migrations must have seemed grounded in nature; whereas in fact their customs and mode of life were more important factors.

For about the space of a century the wage-classes within Christendom have been striving to better their lot in life by the use of the suffrage, by association, by agitation and strikes, sometimes by violence. Thus in *their* judgment there is a social question,

a feeling that what is meet and just does not tend, of its own accord, to come into their hands, but is to be conquered. Another significant fact is the mass of economic literature that issues from the press, perennially, and is absorbed by the reading public. The great reviews of the country have rarely put forth a number during the past decade, that did not treat of some aspect of the social question. This literature of reform recognizes the aspirations of our time, it finds ready acceptance on the part of great numbers and is rapidly leavening the whole people.

The life of socialistic agitation rests chiefly in two things: one is a modern fact, the other a modern sentiment.

The fact is, the tropic growth of wealth in our century. The national wealth of the United Kingdom was 9,000 millions in 1800, but in 1880 it had reached 45,000 millions, a five-fold increase in 80 years. The population increased in this time from 16 to 35 millions, a little more than two-fold; thus nominal wealth has increased over two and a-half times faster than the population, and real wealth at a still faster rate. This unprecedented growth in wealth is due to the modern machine production and improvements in transportation. The labor expended in production grows in effectiveness in proportion as more capital is ever providing more effective machinery. And this growth in national wealth, marvellous as it has been, is doubtless far less than it might have been, if the ever recurring periods of depression had not greatly checked the production and accumulation of capital.

But, when we inquire into the distribution of this wealth, we find a state of things that is indeed remarkable. Instead of a democratic division we find an aristocratic one, while it is no doubt true that the great mass of the people have participated in the progress, especially through the cheapening of commodities, it is just as certain that their share in the accumulated wealth is strangely small. The distribution has been such, that while a goodly number of estates are unmanageably large, the portion falling to the great majority is uncomfortably small. The annual increment to the national wealth is mostly absorbed by the exist-

ing capital. The sponges of capital have developed a wonderful capacity of absorption. We already have sponges that drink up their river, and soon we shall have them capacious enough to drink up a lake; the multi-millionaire has some time been with us and it is already a matter of speculation how soon we may hail the advent of the billionaire. One hundred and fifty persons own one-half the agricultural land of England, and twelve own one-half of Scotland. Of the cultivable soil of Prussia one-half is held in estates averaging 860 acres. The *N. Y. Tribune*, a few years ago, published a list of more than 4,000 millionaires, and the list has grown longer since. England, by reason of her stores of coal and iron, her maritime supremacy, her machinery and the energy of her people, has long enjoyed great advantages over her competitors. She is the richest among the nations, yet, strange to say, we have left her behind in regard to the concentration of wealth. According to the seemingly conservative and conclusive estimate of Thomas Shearman 70 per cent. of the English national wealth is in the hands of $\frac{1}{30}$ of her population, but $\frac{1}{30}$ of our population hold 75 per cent. of ours. If these facts do not carry home the conviction that there is something radically wrong in our social organization, it must remain a hopeless task to work conviction. And in England there is an ancient nobility, that has handed down wealth for generations in its families, besides the accumulations of centuries of industry and commerce; while our great estates are largely the product of the past forty years.

The existence of immensely concentrated wealth has been justified on the ground that these estates form but an insignificant portion of the benefits which arise to the commonwealth through the commercial genius of their founders. By the consolidation and extension of a railway system, for example, one man may have become a multi-millionaire, but the gross saving in freight rates to the public may have amounted to a manifold greater sum than fell to the consolidator. Hence he is fairly entitled to his multi-millions. The underlying idea is, that the value of a service rendered is to be measured by what it would have cost the

party served to perform the service. It may cost the performer of the service a mere trifle, but to the party served the service may be highly valuable. Legal and medical fees are supposed to be sometimes calculated on this basis, but in economics the value of things cannot be estimated in this way. The value of a thing is what it has actually cost to produce it. This justification of the concentration of wealth is significant as showing how brilliant men devise plausible sophistries for wrongs that pay well.

Another defense put forth for these fabulous estates is that no one is injured through their genesis and existence. This justification was attempted for the patrons of the Standard Oil University by one of the professors, but the argument soon got stranded and failed to make the round of the daily press. So long as the wealth and capital are in the country, it is claimed to be indifferent whether they are held by few or many. Thus national wealth, not human well-being, is made the economic end of society. Well, if rents and interest did not mean so much subtracted from the reward of labor, the statement were innocent enough; but as this subtraction is actually made, it ceases to be a matter of indifference to some seventy millions, how wealth is diffused.

We have become familiar in the last few decades with an institution, that seems to be a sure index that our present social system is moribund. That institution is the trust. The significance of the trust lies in this, that it reveals the insufficiency of free competition as the principle of industry. Free competition is the force which has long controlled the process of production and consumption. It has made the industrial sphere an arena, in which whosoever would win, must strive with might for the mastery. In this arena men have compelled each other to put forth a greater and ever greater exertion. Competition puts every one on his mettle, and urges every one to do his best, as no slave-driver ever urged his slaves. It is the struggle for existence in industry, the urgency of self-interest. Its motto is, a fair field and no favor, or, God for us all, and the devil take the hindmost. Nor can there be any doubt that this motive, so powerful and

ever present, has given society a push upward and forward in material things, that is simply tremendous. Whether moral character has been equal to the strain of so fierce a competition is certainly a question; justice, veracity and fraternity, it is to be feared, are often felt to be impediments on this arena, and are often cast aside. Business becomes like war, and in war much passes for fair.

The significance of the trust lies in this: that it is a declaration on the part of the captains of industry that with free competition their business ceases to be profitable. Competition, unchecked, means the destruction of profit for all but those who have special advantages and large diminution of profits even for these. What more simple than to sign a truce in this profit-devouring stage of competition, and thus save that for which business is undertaken? And if the participants in a trust could be trusted to content themselves with fair dividends on the capital actually used in production, there would be no injury to complain of. But it is notorious that trusts are not organized from benevolence or patriotism, but for the purpose of securing inordinate profits, and that they are forced to pay dividends on large plants that stand idle. Probably every branch of industry that has been or can be constituted a trust has a superfluity of invested capital. And it is a sort of robbery on the people to exact from them, through the power of monopoly, profits on plants that are idle and to all interests dead. The amount of capital incorporated in unnecessary plants, superfluous concerns that meet no demand; in rolling mills, distilleries, sugar refineries, parallel railroads, mills and factories of all kinds cannot be told, but it is certainly far in excess of the capital needed to produce the commodities actually called for by the markets. This is only saying that the present accumulation of capital is sufficient to produce far more than the present society can make use of.

A point in the industrial evolution is certainly supposable when all capital cannot find income yielding investment, and the presence of the trust seems to indicate that we are nearing that point, as England has already passed it. England to-day cannot

find employment for its capital at home, but seeks investment everywhere. We thus may see in our present social system signs of old age and decrepitude. The system under which we have made so great progress seems to be nearing that point when its usefulness or sufficiency is outlived, and the work must be carried forward on a different principle, namely, the principle of social coöperation. Society itself, or the state, must become a vast trust, in which the humblest citizen will have his secure position.

The modern sentiment on which socialism lives is the sense of human brotherhood and equality. This we set down, in part, at least, as a direct fruit of Christianity. There can be no doubt that the spirit of Christ is opposed to an unnecessary, artificial division of society into extremes. He uttered no word against slavery; but when master and slave kneel together before the Father, which is in Heaven, and say: Our Father, the relation between them is immediately transformed, not sanctified—that is impossible—but humanized; and the next step will be that both master and slave will feel that the relation is incompatible with their faith. Emancipation is the necessary fruit of the Gospel, and it will remain a proof of Christ's marvellous wisdom that he did not directly attack so great an abuse as slavery; but he gave utterance to principles and awakened a spirit in the hearts of men which must abolish the iniquity as surely as the rays of the ascending sun destroy snow and ice. The sentiment of human worth and human fraternity surely has Christ for its author and patron. Some, called after his name, have opposed the sentiment and still oppose it, but truth tends to prevail. And in part the sense of human right and human equality is a late discovery of the common reason. Our age is eminently a rationalistic age; the next will be such still more—not an age void of reverence and admiration and worship, but an age in which the things revered must justify themselves to the minds and hearts of men. The proportion of men who think and question is larger than ever. And when multitudes toil and endure hardship and comparative poverty, while hundreds are burdened with affluence and luxury, many will ask: Is it a divine or is it a human order that condemns us to our lot?

VIII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ARYANS.

BY REV A. J. HELLER, D. D.

This is the title of a very interesting work written by Isaac Taylor, an English author, and published by the Humbolt Publishing Company, New York. It is the first book in the English language giving an account of the controversy as to the region in which the Aryan race originated. It does not aim at setting forth new views or speculations, but at presenting a summary of the labors of many scholars, and a critical digest of the literature on the subject. "Its object," the author says, "is to present in condensed form a statement of ascertained facts and of the arguments based upon them." Indeed, the book is so replete with facts and arguments closely interwoven, that to give a brief resumé of its contents would be a difficult task, if not one impossible of accomplishment. And we shall not attempt anything of the kind. Our purpose in calling attention to the book is to note the radical changes which the views of the most eminent scholars that have devoted themselves to the study of the subject have undergone since the year 1880, and to present the conclusions to which they have been led, more especially by the discoveries due to the sciences of geology, anthropology, craniology and prehistoric archaeology. If we may judge from the utterances of our popular writers and speakers this book and the subject of which it treats have not received that careful consideration from the students of history and the reading public generally to which their importance entitles them.*

* See, for example, *The Great Races of Mankind*, By Ridpath: The Jones Bros. Publishing Company, Cincinnati, a work recently issued in four large volumes profusely illustrated. In looking through this work our attention was arrested by charts No. 2 and No. 3 in volumes I. and II. respectively. These charts in glaring red lines exhibit the Eastern and Western Aryans as having gone forth in large numbers from the district in Asia lying immediately south of the Caspian sea. In the text of the work the author wholly ignores the results of the best scholarship on the subject.

The corner stone of the new science of comparative philology was laid by Sir William Jones, who, in 1786, "made the memorable declaration that the similarities between Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German and Celtic can only be explained on the hypothesis that these languages had a common parentage." Fifty years later, through the persevering labors of Bopp, the correctness of this hypothesis was confirmed by the permanent establishment of the science of comparative philology. It was then found that one great linguistic family "embraced seven groups of European languages—the Hellenic, Italic, Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, Lithuanic or Lettic, and Albanian; in fact all the existing languages of Europe except Basque, Finnic, Magyar and Turkish. There are also three closely related Asiatic groups—the Indic, containing fourteen modern Indian languages derived from Sanskrit; the Iranic group comprising Zend, Persian, Pushtu or Afghan, Beluchi, Kurdish and Ossetic; and the Armenian, which is intermediate between Greek and Iranian."

But no sooner was the new science placed on a fair footing than it became encumbered by certain erroneous tendencies which led it astray in the interpretation and application of the results of its researches and threw doubt upon its reliability. They also brought it into collision with other sciences with which it should have been closely allied, and by the aid of whose important discoveries its own investigations could have been confirmed. After many years of severe, and at times acrimonious conflict, such a reconciliation has at last been effected. These erroneous tendencies were due to the tenacity with which even men possessed of great knowledge are disposed to cling to traditional beliefs. Until the middle of the present century the chronology of Archbishop Usher, according to which the origin of the human race was assigned to a comparatively recent period, remained unchallenged. It was believed that the cradle of the human race was in Central Asia; that the primeval language was Hebrew; that the diversity of speech dates from the confusion of tongues at Babel, and that the races of Europe were descendants of the family of Japhet, who migrated from the plains of Shinar about

the year 2247 B. C. It was quite natural, therefore, for those who were engaged in the comparative study of the Aryan languages to proceed on the assumption that if the languages had a common parentage, the peoples speaking them must also themselves have had a common ancestry.

For the popularization of this heresy in the sphere of science amongst English-speaking people, Professor Max Müller is justly considered to be chiefly responsible. "In his lectures on the Science of Language, delivered in 1861, instead of speaking only of an Aryan language, he speaks of an 'Aryan race,' an 'Aryan family,' and asserts that there was a time 'when the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Slavs, the Celts, and the Germans were living together within the same inclosure, nay under the same roof,' and he argues that, because the same forms of speech are 'preserved by all the members of the Aryan family, it follows that before the ancestors of the Indians and Persians started for the South, and the leaders of the Greek, Roman, Celtic, Teutonic and Slavonic colonies marched toward the shores of Europe, there was a small clan of Aryans, settled probably on the highest elevation of Central Asia, speaking a language not yet Sanskrit, or Greek, or German, but containing the dialectic germs of all.' He asserted that the same blood runs in the veins of English soldiers 'as in the veins of the dark Bengalese.'"

The French and German scholars of the last quarter of a century "have shown conclusively that the assumption of the common ancestry of the speakers of the Aryan languages is a mere figment, wholly contrary to the evidence, and as improbable as the hypothesis that a small Aryan clan in Central Asia could have sent out great colonies which marched four thousand miles to the shores of Europe." Numerous examples are cited to prove that "identity of speech does not imply identity of race any more than diversity of speech implies diversity of race. The language of Cornwall is the same as the language of Essex, but the blood is Celtic in the one case and Teutonic in the other. The language of Cornwall is different from that of Britany, but the blood is

largely the same. Two related languages, such as French and Italian, point to an earlier language from which both have descended; but it by no means follows that the French and Italians, who speak those languages, have descended from common ancestors." The French anthropologist, Boreca, is quoted as saying that "races have frequently within the historic period changed their language without having apparently changed the race or the type. The Belgians, for instance, speak a neo-Latin language; but of all the races who have mingled their blood with that of autochthons of Belgium, it would be difficult to find one which has left less trace of the people of Rome." And our author pointedly remarks: "The language spoken by the Negro of Alabama resembles the language spoken by the New Englander of Massachusetts," but for all that they are at an immeasurable distance from one another as to race.

After it was adopted that there was an Aryan race in the same sense that there was an Aryan language, the next problem that presented itself for solution was: where did this Aryan race originate? To this inquiry a number of answers were given, but all agreed that the home of the Aryans must have been in Asia. Some placed it in the Valley of the Euphrates, others in the region bordering on the sea of Aral. Adelung placed it in the Valley of Cashmere, which he regarded as the original Paradise. But after it was discovered that Zend, the speech of the Iranians, in the North, was closely related to Sanskrit, the speech of the Indians in the South, and that it was equally archaic in character, it was found that the home of the Aryans would have to be looked for in a more northern region, where the Indians and the Iranians had dwelt together for a time and from which the Indians had journeyed southward into the Punjab. The hypothesis that made Central Asia the cradle of the Indo-Germanic race, had the largest number of adherents, in fact, for fully half a century it received the support of nearly all the great scholars of Europe. Pott fixed on the region north of the Himalaya mountains and east of the Caspian sea, in the valleys of the Oxus and Jaxartes, as the original home of the undivided Aryans.

His argument in support of this opinion he based on the fanciful theory that "the path of the sun must be the path of culture." He was supported in his view by Lassen, who, in 1847, declared his adherence to it "on the ground that the Sanskrit people must have penetrated the Punjab from the northwest through Cabool, and that the traditions of the Avesta point to the slopes of the Belurtag and the Mustag as the place of their earlier sojourn." On this Taylor remarks: "That before their separation the Indo-Iranians were nomad herdsmen inhabiting the steppes between the Oxus and the Jaxartes, is not improbable, but in view of the philological arguments which establish the comparatively late date of the separation of the Indian and Iranian stems, it is now seen that the admission of a Bactrian home for the Indo-Iranians has little bearing on the question." In 1848 the opinion of Potts received the powerful support of Jacob Grimm, who argued that the nations of Europe migrated from Asia under the promptings of an "irresistible impulse." Potts' "path of the sun" and Grimm's "irresistible impulse" may be said to constitute the foundation stones upon which the theory of the Asiatic origin of the Aryans rests. Max Müller, and the scholars of England and Europe generally, adopted the theory. From this speck of earth in Asia great colonies in whose veins ran the blood of a common ancestor streamed forth towards all points of the compass, and especially towards the northeast and west. Müller says, "the main stream of the Aryan nations has always flowed towards the northwest. No historian can tell us by what impulse those adventurous nomads were driven on through Asia toward the isles and shores of Europe. But whatever it was, the impulse was as irresistible as the spell which in our own times sends the Celtic tribes towards the prairies, or the regions of gold across the Atlantic." Elaborate theories of the successive Aryan migrations from central Asia were constructed. The Greeks and Italians were brought by a route south of the Caspian sea through Asia Minor to Greece and Italy; the Celts south of the Caspian through the Caucasus to the north of the Black sea, and then up the Danube to the extreme west of Eu-

rope ; and the Slavs and Teutons by a route north of the Caspian over the Russian steppes to their present seats. But when we come to examine the proofs for these well wrought out and often highly embellished theories we find that they are extremely shadowy and can be summed up in a very few words.

It is alleged that the dialects of Sanskrit and Zend have undergone the least change while the Celtic in the extreme west has undergone a much greater change ; that, consequently, the countries in which Sanskrit and Zend are now in use " must be nearest the primitive center of dispersion ;" that this conclusion is confirmed by the statement in the Avesta that the creation of man by Ormuzd took place in the Bactrian region ; that the only two trees whose names agree in Eastern and Western Aryan, are the birch and the pine, while the mention of snow and ice points to a cold climate ; that the universal Aryan myth of the wanderings of Odysseus may refer to the sea of Aral.

In answer to this our author remarks, that " it is now recognized that the archaic character of Sanskrit and Zend is mainly due to the fact that our knowledge of these languages is derived from documents more ancient than those belonging to any of the languages with which they are compared, that if we confine our attention to contemporary forms of speech, and compare, for instance, modern Lithuanian with any of the vernacular dialects of India, which have descended from Sanskrit, we find that the Lithuanian is immeasurably the more archaic in its character. It may be surmised that if we possessed a Lithuanian literature of a date contemporary with the oldest literature of India, it might be contended with greater reason that the cradle of the Aryan languages must have been in the Lithuanian region. Against the traditions of the Avesta, which are so late as to be valueless, may be placed the certain synchronous traditions of the European Aryans that they were themselves autochthons. The Deucalion legend of the Greeks has as much, or as little, value as the traditions of the Avesta ;" that " the philological deductions as to latitude and climate apply with as much force to Europe as to Asia ; and if the birch and the pine were known to the primi-

tive Aryans, so also, it may be urged was the beech, which, unlike the birch and the pine, is confined to Europe, while the ass and the camel, which were certainly unknown to the undivided Aryans, are especially characteristic of the fauna of Central Asia. As for the sea of Aral, and the wanderings of Odysseus, they are disposed of by the fact that the words for sea and salt are not common to the European and Asiatic Aryans."

But while the philologists were practically unanimous in the opinion that Asia was the cradle of the Aryan race, there was, nevertheless, one of their number, Dr. Latham, of England, who, as early as the year 1851, raised a protest against the belief, pronouncing it a bare assumption unsupported by the evidence. He claimed that the facts pointed to a European rather than an Asiatic origin. He based his argument on the close relation which the Lithuanian language bears to Sanskrit and its no less archaic character, and on the fact that it is more rational to assume that the smaller body in Asia broke away from the larger body in Europe than that the larger body broke away from the smaller.

The argument of Dr. Latham as it has since been enlarged is illustrated by diagram on page twelve of our author's work. The European groups are placed in the form of a circle composed of six links. Beginning with the Slavs, lying to the northeast of Greece, we have them presented in the following order: Slavs, Letts, Germans, Celts, Latins, Greeks. Now it has been shown that there is a close linguistic connection between the Slavs and their immediate neighbors, the Letts, between the Letts and their neighbors on the west, the Germans, as also in like manner between the Germans and Celts; the Celts and Latins, the Latins and Greeks. The nations that are contiguous to each other are more closely related, linguistically, than those which lie apart; for instance, the Slavs are in closer affinity with the Letts, and the Letts with the Germans than are the Germans with the Slavs. It has also been shown that there is no cross connection between the Greeks and the Slavs, nor is there any between the Indo-Iranians and the Latins or the Letts; but the connection

between the Indo-Iranians and the Greeks, and between the Indo-Iranian and the Slavonic has been established.

"Hence the European Aryans form a closely-united chain of six links; but there is one vacant place—one link is missing from the chain. This missing link is found far away in Asia, where we find the Indo-Iranians, who are very closely united with each other, but whose affinities are chiefly with the Slavs on the one hand, and with the Greeks on the other. They clearly constitute the missing link in the chain, which would be complete in its continuity if they had at some former period occupied the vacant post."

"Only two hypotheses are possible. The Aryan languages must either have all originated in Europe * * * ; one member the Indo-Iranian, separating from the rest, and migrating to its present position, or they must all have originated in Asia," and afterward the Western Aryans must have migrated severally to Europe, "preserving in their new homes the precise relative positions which their mutual connections prove must have originally existed. Which is the more probable hypothesis—that of a single migration, the migration of a people whom we know to have been nomads at no distant time, or six distinct migrations of six separate peoples, as to which there is no evidence whatever that they ever migrated at all, and whose traditions assert that they were autochthons?"

Little attention was paid to Dr. Latham's theory. He suffered the fate of most scholars who lived in advance of their time.

But a complete change has taken place in the minds of nearly all the scholars who are versed in the various sciences that have a bearing on the question as to the origin of the Aryans. The philologists themselves have been compelled, one by one, to yield to the logic of newly discovered and well established facts, and to reconsider their former supposed well grounded opinions. At first they followed slowly and somewhat reluctantly in the wake of the anthropologists, who have been the leading advocates and champions of the new view, but within the last decade and a half nearly all have passed over to the rank of their former opponents.

The change is owing to the new sciences of geology, anthropology, craniology and prehistoric archaeology. The assumption that man is a comparatively recent inhabitant of our earth, the traditional belief that Asia is the original cradle of the human race, and that the Aryans are the lineal descendants of the family of Japhet, which for so long a period dominated the thinking of men, have been finally given up. For the oldest historical records of human life are no longer the tablets bearing cuneiform inscriptions, and the pottery rescued from the ruins of ancient cities on the Euphrates and the Nile. These carry us back only six thousand years at most.

The oldest records made by human agency are the "memorials of successful hunts, preserved in the caves of Dordogne, which were inscribed by the contemporaries of the mammoth on the bones and tusks of extinct animals, compared with which the records on Babylonian tablets or Egyptian tombs, much more the traditions of the Avesta, are altogether modern." Linguistic archaeology "takes us back to a period older than all written records, to an age before the invention of writing or the discovery of metals, when the first rude plough was a crooked bough, and the first ship a hollow log propelled by poles."

From craniology it has been learned that the peoples "who now speak the Aryan languages do not belong to one race, and that the same races which now inhabit Europe have inhabited it continuously since the neolithic period, when the wild horse and reindeer roamed over Europe.

"The sciences of prehistoric archaeology and geology have extended still further the history of the human race, and have shown that in western Europe man was the contemporary of the mammoth and the woolly rhinoceros and other extinct pachyderms, and have brought to light from the gravels of Abbeville evidences of his handiwork, dating from a period when the Somme flowed three hundred feet above its present level and England was yet united to the continent." It is believed that man "must have inhabited France and Britain at the close of the quarter-nary period, and must have followed the retreating ice of the

glacial epoch, to the close of which Dr. Croll and Professor Geike assign on astronomical grounds an antiquity of some eighty thousand years." Three consecutive ages have been established, the stone age, the bronze age, and the iron age. They are not necessarily synchronous in different countries. Greece was in the iron age when Italy was yet in the bronze age and the rest of Europe in the stone age. The stone age is divided into two periods, the paleolithic, or age of chipped flints, and the neolithic, or age of polished stone. With the paleolithic era, however, the question under consideration does not have anything to do. Whether the men of that extremely early age were the progenitors of the races whose records date from neolithic times can perhaps never be told. There have been no discoveries by which a continuity can be certainly established. And the flint flakes taken from the till produced by the last extension of the glaciers give no clew as to race or language. But in the much later neolithic period, when the geology and climate of Europe were already essentially the same as they are now, abundant evidence has been found to prove that three, if not four of the existing types occupied approximately their present sites.

It is now well understood and generally acknowledged on all hands that the evolution and differentiation of the numerous Aryan languages demands a very much longer period of time than the hypothesis that Central Asia was the cradle of the Indo-European peoples allows. The extension of this time limit is now supplied by the contrary hypothesis of a European origin, since the antecedents of the present Aryan-speaking peoples there may be traced to the builders of the shell mounds in Denmark and of the kitchen middens and lake dwellings in Switzerland. The minimum date for the commencement of the neolithic age is placed at ten thousand years. The calculations are all of a rough character, but after all due allowance has been made it cannot have covered less time. The kitchen middens of Denmark are quite numerous and very large. Some are as much as nine hundred feet long and from one hundred to two hundred feet broad. The average thickness is from three to five feet, but some are as

much as ten feet in thickness. The stone implements found in these mounds are more archaic in character than those taken from the Swiss lake dwellings. It has been supposed by some that they represent a transitional stage between the paleolithic and the neolithic eras. They indicate that the people were hunters and fishermen, that they had not yet reached the pastoral stage. The only domesticated animal was the dog. The Swiss lake dwellers, while still living largely by the chase, had domesticated the ox and probably also the sheep and the goat. The shell mounds are, therefore, of very early origin. The degree of civilization which they disclose is much ruder than linguistic archæology demands for the undivided Aryans. They are composed of the shells of oysters and mussels, of the bones of animals and fish, with a few fragments of pottery. Flint tools are very abundant. The population, depending wholly upon fishing and hunting for subsistence, must have been extremely sparse. Consequently the accumulation of so large an amount of refuse must have required many centuries, if not millenniums. Moreover, many centuries must have elapsed since the completion of these mounds, for they are now quite a distance inland, the sea having receded, owing to the slow and gradual tilting of the land, a process which is still going on at the rate of a few inches a century. "On the site of the city of Glasgow there have been dug up, from a considerable depth, three rude canoes, one of which reposed on a bed of sea sand, a quarter of a mile from the river Clyde, and twenty-six feet above its present high-water level. Mr. Robert Chambers, of Scotland, who investigated the circumstances of these discoveries, states 'that we have scarcely an alternative to the supposition, that when these vessels foundered, and were deposited where in modern times they have been found, the firth of Clyde was a sea several miles wide at Glasgow, and covering the site of a portion of the city.' "* One of these canoes contained, when discovered, a beautifully shaped and polished stone hatchet.

There are in Denmark also unmistakable evidences of three

* Wells' Principles of Geology.

consecutive periods of vegetation, the age of fir, the age of oak, and the age of beech. "In the Roman period the country was covered, as it is now, by vast forests of beech. These changes in the vegetation are attributed to slow secular changes of climate. The stone age agrees mainly with that of the fir, and partly with that of the oak; the bronze age agrees mainly with the period of the oak, and the iron age with that of the beech. The shell mounds, which belong to the early neolithic period, belong to the age of the fir, since the bones of the capercaillie, a bird which feeds on the young shoots of the fir, have been found in the kitchen middens, while stone implements of the kitchen midden type have been discovered in the peat bogs among the stumps of the firs." In view of all this Professor Steenstrup thinks that "from ten thousand to twelve thousand years must be allowed for the accumulation of the vast mounds of refuse and for the successive changes of the forests from fir to oak, and from oak to beech, which can only be due to considerable changes of climate—changes, moreover, which had already been effected at the commencement of the iron age."

Another method of time measurement is afforded by the peat bogs in which neolithic implements are buried. It is calculated that at least from four thousand to six thousand years were required for the formation of some of these bogs.

The Swiss lake dwellings are considered the best natural chronometers, but as the civilization which they disclose is already in advance of that required by the undivided Aryans, they give only the minimum, not the maximum limit of time for Aryan settlement. One example taken from the author's book must suffice. "At Point de la Thiele, between the lakes of Bienne and Neuchâtel, there is a pile dwelling of neolithic age which is now three thousand feet inland from the present shore of the lake." A calculation based on the rate at which the lake is now filling up with sediment "would give for the foundation of this settlement a minimum antiquity of six thousand seven hundred and fifty years, or about four thousand nine hundred before Christ. At this time, therefore, the neolithic people had abandoned the

nomad life of the undivided Aryans, and had acquired the skill requisite to build their habitation on piles driven into the bed of the lake ; but how much earlier the neolithic period began we have no means of ascertaining."

Many similar examples are cited to show that the centuries required for the evolution of the Aryan languages can be accounted for by the evidence we have of the occupation of Europe by man from immemorial times, if not from that remote period when this part of our globe first became fitted for human habitation.

It is also now admitted that the evolution and differentiation of so many Aryan languages required a numerous semi-nomadic pastoral people wandering with their flocks and herds over a vast territory not divided by insurmountable mountain barriers, impassable swamps or impenetrable forests, a country with a soil fairly productive, and a climate not too severe, but yet sufficiently rigorous to develop sturdy physical powers and heroic characters. It is now conceded that the theatre of the primitive Aryans must have been in the north and not in the south, because the names for trees indigenous to the temperate zone, for snow and ice, for the two seasons, summer and winter, certain grains, etc., all point to a northern habitat. In compliance with this demand of the facts various sections were suggested by different scholars, as the Rokitno swamp, between the Pripet, the Beresina and the Dnieper, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. But each one of these was unsuited for the maintenance of such a numerous nomadic people as the ancient Aryans must have been. The district which most nearly answers all the requirements, it is claimed, is that part of Europe north of the Alps and extending from the Ural mountains on the east to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean on the west. The district in Asia lying east of the Caspian Sea and stretching a thousand miles beyond Lake Balkash has been named as supplying by its fauna and flora all the linguistic conditions of the problem. But much of this territory is too barren and inhospitable to support so numerous a population. Besides, it has, as far as known, always been occupied by Mongol tribes. And there is not a single vestige of any record left there to indi-

cate that it was ever occupied by the Aryans, whilst there is the most positive evidence that the Aryan peoples at present occupying the larger scope of country in Europe, and the one in all respects better adapted to the purpose, are the descendants of those who sojourned there in prehistoric times. All this seems to meet the conditions of the problem presented in the many kindred languages of Europe and Asia.

The theory of the evolution of the Aryan languages which has resulted from the researches and discussions covering a period of two decades or more is based on the principle that languages "are due to some unknown tendency to variation, coupled with extermination of intermediate varieties and the survival of the prepotent." In the first place, the original Aryan tribe, through its greater strength and more aggressive spirit, extended its sway by conquering non-Aryan tribes and imposing upon them its language. In the second place, the displaced language would naturally leave its impress upon the successful one. Third, the difficulty of acquiring a new language would tend to greatly modify the new speech amongst the conquered peoples, and finally, that, whilst at some time the geographical continuity of primitive Aryan speech was unbroken, eventually at certain points centers of disturbance, of new linguistic formations, or new phonetic variations arose which spread like concentric waves. These waves gradually weakened as they enlarged and at last colliding, those coming in direct contact very naturally preserved a closer affinity of speech than those situated at a distance from each other. The people, having now passed the pastoral stage and beginning to cultivate the soil, would, at these centers of disturbance, become organized into separate communities which would gradually spread southward and eastward. Thus the progress from a rude stage of barbarism towards a higher stage of civilization in which fixed governmental institutions are found has been historically continuous in Europe, and there is not the least evidence of a cataclism having taken place, such as the abrupt intrusion of a vast multitude of people migrating from Asia who, with bronze and iron weapons, drove out the original inhabitants, and, on the basis of their superior

civilization and culture, established a new and different order of things. On the contrary, the relics taken from the barrows of England and the Swiss lake dwellings demonstrate the fact that the use of metal implements was gradually introduced, and that these implements were acquired by barter, and that they were brought from the south. Whatever changes have taken place, in language and culture, it is now understood, have been gradually evolved, and have required many centuries for their execution. On the same principle geologists now account for the present configuration of our globe.

If the geological discoveries establishing the early existence of the human race in Europe have been startling, the deductions of the craniologists, drawn from the comparison of skulls taken from the sepulchral mounds and caves of those ancient denizens, if not wholly convincing, are certainly not less surprising.

"As to the nature of the speech of the neolithic peoples of Europe we have inferences rather than positive facts to guide us. As to their physical characteristics the evidence is abundant and conclusive. This evidence consists partly of the statement of Greek and Roman writers, but is obtained mainly from the measurement of skulls. The shape of the skull is one of the least variable characteristics of race, so much so that the skulls from prehistoric tombs made it possible to prove that the neolithic inhabitants of Europe were the direct ancestors of the existing races. The skull form is expressed by the numerical ratios of certain measurements which are called indexes." Of these the most important are the cephalic index, giving the proportion of the extreme breadth to the extreme length of the cranium; the altitudinal, giving the proportion of the height of the skull to the length; the orbital, giving the proportion of the height of the eye orbit to the breadth; the facial angle, the nasal index, and the index of prognathous by which the shape of the face is estimated. By these indexes in conjunction with the shape of certain bones, the ethnic relationships of prehistoric to existing races may be determined with considerable certainty.

Another test is that of the hair. In the Mongolian the section

of the hair is circular ; in the African it is flat ; in the white or European it is oval. "The hair of the Mongolian is straight, that of the African frizzled or woolly, that of the European is inclined to curl.

"All these tests agree in exhibiting two extreme types—the African with long heads, long orbits and flat hair ; and the Mongolian with round heads, round orbits and round hair. The European type is intermediate, the head, the orbit, and the hair are oval. In the east of Europe we find an approximation to the Asiatic types ; in the south of Europe to the African. The neolithic tombs of Europe exhibit notable approximations both to the African and Asiatic types."

When Cæsar entered Gaul he found there three races, the Aquitanians, the Celts and the Belgæ, and beyond the Rhine a fourth, the Germans. These four races, it is claimed, can be traced in the neolithic tombs of Europe. "But it is evident that only one of these four races can represent the primitive Aryans, the others being merely Aryan in speech, but non-Aryan by descent."

In England and on the continent of Europe have been found many ancient burial mounds and caves. These have been thoroughly explored. Many skeletons, and parts of skeletons, of those ancient mound-builders, some of which are remarkably well preserved, have been collected from all parts of the continent and the adjoining islands. They have been carefully measured and compared. It is very plain that the oldest people of whom we have any record are those who buried their dead in caves, since the remains of wild animals are common in the caves, but rare in the mounds or barrows. There is every reason to believe that when the people abandoned the caves, they had reached the pastoral stage. The long mounds or barrows seem to have been built after the pattern of the cave. Many are four hundred feet in length, fifty in breadth and are "provided with interior chambers and passages." The long barrows all belong to the stone age, "no trace of metal has been found in any undisturbed part of a long barrow, while pottery of any kind is very infrequent."

The remains taken from the cave sepulchres, and those taken

from the long barrows are all of the same type; they exhibit a dolichocephalic, or long headed, an orthognathous, or oval featured race, of short stature and of feeble muscular development. This race has been identified by ethnologists with the Silures, who at the time of the Roman conquest inhabited certain counties of England. It is found in some of the Hebrides, in the west of England and in Wales. Tacitus notes the resemblances between the Silures of the British Isles and the Iberians of Spain, and conjectures that the Silurians were Iberians who had crossed over from Spain into England. It is a notable fact that the Spanish Basques do bear a striking resemblance to the small dark Welshmen of Denbigshire. And now that this same type has been traced along the Atlantic Coast southward to Spain and the countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea in the caves and mounds of France and Spain, both these peoples have been identified as the descendants of the long barrow people, who have been assigned the name Iberian. They ranged over the greater part of France, but seem not to have reached Germany or northeastern Europe. At Chauvaux a sepulchral cave was found containing skulls of the long barrow type, whose mean cephalic index is 71.8, and also pottery of the neolithic age. This cave marks the northeastern extension of the race. If they may be identified with the Aquitani of Cæsar, they must have retreated to the Pyrenees before the historic period. In the Caverne de l'Homme Mort, in the Department of Lozère, some fifty bodies were interred, and fifteen of the skeletons have been so well preserved as to admit of accurate measurement, and even of the determination of the sex. The measurements establish the identity of this race with the long barrow people of Britain. The Iberian race seems to have occupied all Spain, the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, for in all these regions skulls of the long barrow type have been found. "In Pliny's time the Canaries were not inhabited. When occupied by the Spaniards in the beginning of the fifteenth century the natives were still in the stone age, using caves for habitation and for sepulture." Mummied bodies

in the caves of Teneriffe correspond in measurements to those found at Gibralter, southern France and Wales. "The Iberian race was probably of dark complexion, with black hair and eyes. Their presumed descendants, the Welshmen of Denbigshire, the Irish of Donegal and Kerry, the Corsicans and Spanish Basques, and the Berbers are swarthy."

Near the close of the neolithic age an altogether different race comes upon the scene; a race that is tall, muscular and brachycephalic, with yellow or reddish hair and florid complexion. These are the people of the round barrows, who probably erected Avebury and Stonehenge in England. They also probably introduced into Britain Aryan speech and implements of bronze. They have been identified with the Celts, and are supposed "to be an offshoot, through the Belgic Gauls, from the great brachycephalic stock of central and northeastern Europe and Asia." A glance at the illustrations exhibiting front and side views of skulls taken from the long barrows of the Iberians in comparison with those taken from the round barrows of the Celts is sufficient to convince one that they belong to wholly different types. "In the Celtic skull the head is massive and powerful, the face angular and prognathous, with a projecting mouth and powerful jaws. The broad, capacious forehead and the short, square chin indicate mental power and determination of character. The cheek bones are high and broad, the orbits of the eyes nearly circular, with supraciliary ridges well developed, which must have given a fierce and beetling aspect to the face. The nose must have projected forwards, and the sockets of the front teeth are oblique. The skulls of this race are usually distinguished by their capacity and vertical height, which is actually greater than their breadth."

In striking contrast with this type the Iberian "face is oval, feeble and orthognathous; the forehead narrow; the chin weak, pointed and elongated. The nose is usually not so broad as in the other race, but longer by a quarter of an inch, the space between the nostrils and the mouth considerable, giving a weak upper lip, and the sockets of the front teeth are vertical. Neither

the cheek bones nor the supraciliary ridges are developed, and the orbits of the eyes are somewhat elongated. The aspect of the face must have been mild and gentle. The vertical views of the skulls show that the greater length of the one, and the greater breadth of the other is due to occipital developments. The difference of the skulls extends also to the other bones of the skeleton. The Iberian race was short, with slender bones and feeble muscular attachments, while the Celtic race was tall, powerful and muscular."

The Celtic race has been traced in a broad zone across the continent of Europe to the Tiber, and eastward down the Danube, and across the great plains of Russia. They also at a later day spread southward through France, imposing their speech on the earlier races of that region. The south Germans are brachycephalic, but Teutonic in speech. It is known, however, that they were Teutonized during the first centuries of our era. The local names are of Celtic origin, and the older tombs contain both orthocephalic and brachycephalic skulls. The Danes, Hessians, Swabians, Bavarians, Lower Franconians, the inhabitants of the Breisgau and Upper Italy, all belong to this brachycephalic type. Also all the nations of Slavic speech, their hair and eyes are mostly light in color.

In the iron age a new type appears in England, which, though dolicocephalic, like that of the round barrows, is radically dissimilar, "the forehead is narrow, the brow low and retreating, the cranial vault low, the nose narrow but prominent, the orbital ridges are well marked, and the back of the skull well developed." It was a very tall race, some specimens being upwards of six feet in height. It has been termed the Scandinavian or Teutonic race, owing to the fact that wherever the Goths, Franks, Burgundians and Saxons made conquests in England, France, Spain, Italy and Eastern Europe, this type of skull has been found. It occupied, at a very early period, mainly the valley of the Rhine, extending, however, as far south as to Würtemberg, and east as far as to Brüx in Bohemia. At a later period it is found on the shores of the Baltic. The Swedes, who

at the present day, are the most dolichocephalic and also the tallest people in Europe, are regarded as the descendants of this race, though in Scandinavia the type has been greatly modified by the infusion of Celtic or Slavic blood. Owing to the prepotence of the Celtic race, the type has become extinct in Germany, but there are curious cases of reversion to an earlier type, of which three examples are given: the skull of Robert Bruce, who was of Norman blood, the skull of St. Mansuel, the Apostle of the Belgic Gauls, who in the fourth century was bishop of Toul in Lorraine. The most remarkable case is that of a Danish gentleman who lived in the seventeenth century. His skull was of the Neanderthaloid or Cronstadt (skulls of a very low order) type, with receding forehead and an enormous development of the supraciliary ridges. These reversions to an earlier type, which occur chiefly among men of Scandinavian or Norman extraction, themselves have an important bearing on the question as to the relationship between the present inhabitants of Europe and the people of prehistoric times whose seats they now occupy.

Another race is that of the Ligurians. Of the three races which Cæsar found in Gaul, the Belgæ have been identified with the people of the round barrows, and the Aquitani with the people of the long barrows. The Celtæ occupied the central and hilly part of France; and this part of France, Broca, the French anthropologist, maintains has been continuously occupied by their lineal descendants, who are a short, dark, extremely brachycephalic race. He also claims that they are the true Celts of history. This type has not been found in the British barrows, nor can it be identified with any of the existing people of Great Britain, but it is found in great purity in Auvergne, Dauphiny, Savoy, the Grisons, and the Maritime Alps. Physically they resemble the Lapps, having the same cephalic index, being of a swarthy complexion and possessed of black hair and eyes. But the principal correspondence consists in this, that both races have "the smallest parietal angle of any existing races—that is, the head is abnormally narrow across the cheek bones, and wide at the temples." The stature of the Lapps and Ligurians is also in agreement.

The former are the shortest race in Europe; the latter the shortest in France, and the shortest race now speaking any Aryan language.

At Grenelle, near Paris, vestiges corresponding to the existing type of Ligurians have been found in the alluvium and underlying gravels in the ancient bed of the Seine, farther north in limestone caves near Furfooz, three hundred miles further south in the Department of Lozere, "now inhabited by the brachycephalic Auvernat race, and in the prehistoric graves of eastern Switzerland."

Having thus, by a great mass of evidence drawn from these sepulchral sources, established the fact that the present inhabitants of Europe are the descendants of the races who, in neolithic times, occupied the same seats, the author proceeds to establish the continuity of development in regard to culture. We have not space to present a tithe of the evidence upon which the argument is based, but can only say that it seems most conclusive. "In the oldest lake dwellings of Germany and Switzerland we find the remains of a people, believed to have been the ancestors of the Celtic race, usually in possession of cattle, but living mainly on the product of the chase. We trace them during a period which must cover many centuries, at first clad only in skins, then learning to weave mats from the bark of trees, and finally flax. We find them at first in possession of only the ox, and successively domesticating the goat, the sheep and the pig, and, last of all, the horse. We then see them acquiring by degrees considerable proficiency in agriculture, and passing gradually from the age of stone to the age of bronze, and from the age of bronze to that of iron." That the bronze and iron implements came from the South, and were procured by barter from the Mediterranean people is shown by the fact that they are more numerous in the lake dwellings of that region than in those in the North, and that in many they are modeled after the stone implements, while the ages of stone and bronze apparently overlap each other. All of which overthrows the theory of a conquering people possessed of a considerable degree of civilization coming from the East. There is not a particle of evidence to show that there was any such abrupt transition as is involved in the latter view.

The results of philological research, limited and corrected by archæological discovery are briefly summarized as follows: "That the speakers of the primitive Aryan tongue were nomad herdsmen, who had domesticated the dog, who wandered over the plains of Europe in wagons drawn by oxen, who fashioned canoes out of the trunks of trees, but were ignorant of any metal, with the possible exception of native copper. In the summer they lived in huts, built of branches of trees and thatched with reeds; in winter they dwelt in circular pits dug in the earth and roofed over with poles, covered with sods of turf or plastered with the dung of cattle. They were clad in skins sewn together with bone needles; they were acquainted with fire, which they kindled by means of fire-sticks or pyrites; and they were able to count up to one hundred. If they practiced agriculture it must have been of a primitive kind; but they probably collected and pounded in stone mortars the seeds of some wild cereal—either spelt or barley. The only social institution was marriage; but they were polygamists, and practiced human sacrifice. Whether they ate the bodies of enemies taken in war is doubtful. There were no enclosures, and property consisted in cattle, not in land. They believed in a future life; their religion was shamanistic; they had no idols, and probably no gods properly so called, but revered in some vague way the powers of nature."

This answers the demands of linguistic archæology. All the culture words common to the Aryan languages, or for which an Aryan etymology has been found, point back to this rude stone age, before any linguistic separation took place.

The author also undertakes to show that the probabilities favor the belief that, of the four primitive races of Europe, the Celtic were the primitive Aryans who conquered other tribes and imposed upon them their speech.

In reading this highly interesting book we were impressed with the fact, too, that students of secular science are often as slavishly bound by tradition as, it is sometimes alleged, are the students of sacred science; that it is well to keep an open mind; that it is as perilous to cling too tenaciously to that which is old, as to embrace too eagerly that which is new.

IX.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

RELATION OF THE PULPIT TO QUESTIONS OF POLITICS AND ETHICS.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Union of Philadelphia, some time ago, the Rev. Dr. Tupper read a paper touching the policy of the government in relation to the Turkish outrages in Armenia. This was objected to by the Rev. Dr. Thomas A. Hoyt, on the ground that Christian ministers have no commission and no right to deal with matters of this kind. These are secular things, with which ministers of the Gospel as such can have no concern. Their business is simply to preach the Gospel. Their authority is a "Thus saith the Lord." Hence they can have nothing to do with questions of politics or government, which are merely questions of expediency, concerning which there is no infallible revelation. In a sermon preached subsequently, Dr. Hoyt states his position more explicitly, and maintains that ministers of the Gospel as ambassadors of Christ, "have nothing to speak but what Christ tells them." They have no concern with the affairs of this life. Their only business is to beseech men to be reconciled unto God. They are not even to be teachers of ethics. "Ethics is excluded from the pulpit," says Dr. Hoyt, "as well as politics. Ethics is not religion, and religion is the one theme of the pulpit."

The question involved in this discussion is one which admits of something being said on both sides. It will be generally admitted, we presume, that Christian ministers are especially called to be ministers of religion. They minister to men in holy things. They are servants of Christ whose chief duty it is to bring men into the obedience of Christ, and to be helpers of God in the development of the religious life of believers. They are not pro-

fessors of science, of law, or of political economy, but teachers of religion. Their special calling is to preach the Word of God. They are to develop and illustrate the meaning of God's revelation in Christ. They are to speak to men about the nature and character of God; they are to make known God's will in regard to men; they are to tell men about God's love and righteousness; they are to point sinful men to Jesus, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; they are to preach of faith, of repentance, of judgment, of Heaven, and of eternal life. The example of Christ and of the Apostles, who generally abstained from any discussion of the social and political questions of their time, it may be said, should be the law for Christian ministers now. Christ's personal ministry on earth had reference entirely to the establishment of the kingdom of God. He refused to be entangled in any questions relating to secular affairs, such as the division of inheritances, or the payment of tribute. And the apostle Paul refused to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. It was the message of the cross, and not any world-wisdom, that he regarded as the power of God unto salvation. And now to turn the pulpit into an arena for the discussion of all sorts of subjects, from national finance, or international policy, to the latest novel, would be an entire subversion of the rule followed by the original preachers of the New Testament. This is not becoming to the Christian ministry. So far there will probably be little difference of opinion.

But when it is said that the pulpit has nothing to do with ethics, because ethics is not religion, and that it must be wholly dumb on all questions of social philosophy, national politics, and international relations, then many will protest that this is an unwarranted limitation of the scope and influence of the Christian ministry. Some of the wisest and best men who have ever labored in the ministry would not have been willing to have the sphere of their teaching and preaching thus restricted. The great preachers of antiquity did not hesitate to discuss political affairs; in this respect imitating the example of the prophets of the Old Testament rather than the apostles and the evangelists of

the New. And in times of great national crises, especially, when men's minds were disturbed by great political and social questions, Christian ministers of the saintliest character have not hesitated to come forward as teachers of their fellows in regard to the duties of the hour. This was the case in the time of the Reformation, in the time of the Puritan Revolution in England, in the time of our struggle for independence, and again, as many of our readers will remember, in the time of our civil war. And, in fact, it has been the case more or less at all times. Has this been all wrong? Has it been treason to the Gospel of Christ? According to the narrow rule laid down by Dr. Hoyt, it has.

But we can not accept that rule. We can not consent to the idea of such a radical divorcement between religion and ethics as that rule would imply. Religion, indeed, is not ethics; and yet religion and ethics are most closely connected. This is especially true of the Christian religion. Heathenism may get along without much morality, but not so Christianity. Are not most of the discourses of Jesus of an ethical character? And is not this true also of the discourses and writings of the Apostles? Are there not in the writings of the Apostles contained lists of duties for all stations in life—for husbands and wives, for parents and children, for masters and servants, for rulers and subjects? Are not the ten commandments contained in the Bible, of which six, at least, are of an wholly ethical character, and do not these afford legitimate material for pulpit instruction? How, then, can any one say that the pulpit has nothing to do with ethics, nor ethics with religion? St. James even goes so far as directly to identify ethical with religious activities. He says that "pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Surely the acts here commended are in their nature ethical, and yet they are religious too. The sin of defrauding laboring men out of their just wages could not be more sharply condemned by modern socialists than it is condemned by St. James in 5: 4-6. If a minister were to preach from that text on the economic and ethical question of

fair wages to laborers, would he then be violating the law of the Christian ministry?

Alexander Vinet says that the object of the Christian pulpit is to *introduce the Christian idea into life*. To introduce the Christian idea into life means to cause men's life and conduct to become what Christ's idea of humanity requires that they should be. Christ unquestionably has an idea, a law, a rule, by which men's life on earth ought to be directed and controlled. Christ is not indifferent as to the manner in which men live here. And Christ's idea of human life relates not merely to men's conduct on Sunday, but to their conduct during all the days of the week, and not merely to their behavior in church, but also to their behavior in business. Men are to be Christians not only in church, but also in the store, the shop, the mill, the bank. They are not only to pray in Christian fashion, but they are to act in Christian fashion, or according to the principles of Christ, when they deal with their fellow men in things of this world. Whatsoever they do, whether in word or in deed, they are to do all in the name of the Lord Jesus. And surely the Christian pulpit has something to do with making men thus subject to the law of Christ. Or shall we suppose that the pulpit is properly employed in discussions of the location of Paradise and the rivers of Eden, or of the obligation of psalm singing and the wickedness of the use of musical instruments, and not properly employed in discussions relating to the proper conduct of men in society or the ethical foundations of society itself?

But it may be said that all that is required in order to make men live according to the law of Christ is to get the principle or germ of Christian life into their souls, and then the unfolding of the flower and fruit will come spontaneously. All that the pulpit needs to do is to sow the seed of the Gospel in men's hearts. The growing will take place according to the law immanent in the seed itself. In other words, if men are soundly converted and made Christians, they will do the works of God without any instruction or teaching. Now this would be the case doubtless if the Christian life were merely a physical process.

But the Christian life is a moral process, requiring at every point self-conscious direction and control. In this respect the progress of the Christian life may be compared to the development of mental life. In order to the process of intellectual development it is not enough that there be in the soul the principle of mind with its native laws and categories. There must be instruction, direction, discipline—stimulation of the mental energies by the power of developed mind. And so there must be instruction and direction also in order to the right development of Christian morality. In a word, there must be moral teaching, and this must be imparted by the pulpit. It is not enough that men are baptized and made Christians. They must be *taught* to observe all things which the Master has commanded. And this will require a great amount of concrete ethical instruction, in which the collective conscience of the Church hovers over, stimulates, and quickens the individual conscience. It is not enough, for instance, that men be told that they must love their neighbors as themselves. They often need concrete instruction as to what that means and requires. Had the Prophet Nathan simply repeated to David a general formula about loving one's neighbor and doing no harm to any one, he would have accomplished nothing. It was necessary for him to relate the story of the ewe-lamb, and then to thunder into the ears of the king, "Thou art the man." And so the pulpit, if it would accomplish anything, must often impart very concrete ethical instruction.

It may be said, however, that such instruction, at any rate, can only refer to the private life and conduct of Christians, and can have nothing to do with the duty of citizens in regard to such matters as economics, politics and policies of government. "Politics is a question of expediency only," says Dr. Hoyt. That is doubtless true of the politics of the professional politicians of our time. But is that right? Are there no moral principles involved in politics, and no moral responsibilities in national and governmental policies? Has Christ no concern with matters of this kind? Is it a sin which God will punish if *one* man wrongs another man, but not a sin if a *body* of men collectively, through

their government, wrong some one man, or some class of men, or some other and weaker nation? Has Christ no mind on such matters as these, and shall those who profess to speak to the world in His name not declare His mind? The prophets of the Old Testament, who likewise may be regarded as to some extent examples for the Christian ministry, spoke out on such subjects very plainly. They did not hesitate to discuss national policies, and to rebuke kings, and courts, and politicians for any violations of the law of right. The fact that Christ and the Apostles refrained from discussing questions and policies of government may be explained on another principle than that of indifference. They lived under a despotism which allowed no freedom of discussion and mercilessly suppressed all criticism of public acts. In these circumstances the only condition of personal safety was silence. Under such a government, moreover, the citizen has but little responsibility for the actions of rulers. The people can only be responsible to the extent that common opinion sustains and supports the policies of government. But how is it in a country in which the people are themselves the government, and in which the agents of government are unable to do any thing in the face of adverse public sentiment? Do not the people here share in the responsibility of the acts of their rulers? And does not Christ, then, have something to say to them in regard to the manner in which they vote, and in regard to the governmental policies which they either tolerate or encourage and support? If He has, then plainly it is the duty of the Christian ministry to know and say it for Him.

Dr. Hoyt says that the minister's authority must be a "Thus says the Lord." He must deliver the message which Christ has given him to deliver, and may only speak what Christ commands him to speak. Very well; we are willing to accept that view of the minister's duty. What, then, does Christ have to say on the massacre of Armenian Christians by the cowardly and selfish connivance of the governments of Europe? What does he have to say to those governments and to the people whom they represent? What does Christ have to say to the people of the United States

about those Spanish butcheries in the island of Cuba? Will it be said that Christ has no mind and no message on matters of this kind? Does Dr. Hoyt suppose that the "Thus saith the Lord," which forms the Christian preacher's commission, must always be found written in some chapter and verse of the Bible, and that Christ has no mind and no will on any subject in regard to which no such written instructions can be found? That, we think, would be a poor conception of the Christian ministry, and a most unworthy conception of Christ Himself. That the minister is bound to the Scriptures as the rule of Christian faith and duty we believe, just as firmly as we believe that ordinarily he is a teacher of religion and not of sociology; but we also believe that Christ is not indifferent to the affairs of this world, and that those who faithfully study their Bibles and listen to the voice of the Spirit may know what His will is concerning those affairs. It is one thing to know Christ in the flesh, that is, to know Him *historically*, and another thing to know Him in the Spirit. The latter mode of knowing Him may not contradict the former, nevertheless it may go immeasurably beyond it, and bring the mind of the human subject into immediate touch with the mind of Christ. It is in this sense, we think, that the apostle Paul says "We have the mind of the Lord."

We believe, then, that Christ has a mind, a will—that He has something to say—on all subjects of human interest. He has something to say on war and peace, on government and finance, and on all the social and economic questions which agitate the age. And what He has to say is the very thing that is needed in order to redeem human affairs from the curse of confusion and misery under which they are now laboring. It is not an appeal to *Mammon* that can ultimately settle questions of international relations and of domestic policy, but only an appeal to the law and mind of Christ. We believe that Christ has something to say to the sociological questions which are so profoundly agitating our own country at the present time—questions which can no longer be settled by an appeal to Adam Smith; and we believe that the future peace and prosperity of the country will depend upon whether

the Christian ministry generally will listen to what Christ has to say, and faithfully and fearlessly deliver His message to rich and poor alike. Let not ministers shrink from their duty under the pretense of limitation of their authority. They have authority, not indeed to turn politicians, stump orators, or demagogic agitators, but to teach all that Christ has commanded them concerning the things of this world as well as of that which is to come; and to reason of righteousness, of temperance, and of judgment to come before the Felixes, and Drusillas, and Agripas of this age until they not *only tremble, but are converted*.

MELANCHTHON, THE TEACHER OF ALL THE CHURCHES.

Philip Melancthon, the four hundredth anniversary of whose birth was celebrated on the 16th of February of the present year, though the special coadjutor of Luther in the work of the German Reformation, belongs not merely to the Lutheran Church and to the sixteenth century. All Protestant denominations are indebted to him, and all times have been benefitted by his teaching. All the churches may claim him as their own, and all owe him a debt of gratitude as their common teacher, of which they will doubtless show some sense of appreciation during this anniversary year. This should especially be the case in our own Reformed Church, which is in some sense the creation of his spirit, and in which his mind has in some respects come to a clearer expression than in the Lutheran Church itself. It is fitting, therefore, that we should participate, to some extent at least, in the demonstrations of rejoicing over his illustrious name, and that we should study his character and meditate upon the import and tendency of his teaching.

Melancthon was born in the town of Bretten, in the Lower Palatinate, of pious parents, who were in comfortable circumstances, and able accordingly to procure for him the educational advantages befitting his genius. He was early sent to the University of Heidelberg, which then did not amount to much as a school of learning, but upon whose character he was destined in

after life to exert an important influence. From Heidelberg, after having obtained his bachelor's degree, he removed to the University of Tübingen, where he came under the direct influence of his celebrated uncle, John Reuchlin, the greatest Hebrew scholar of the time. Here, at the age of seventeen, he received the degree of master of arts. He had devoted himself especially to the study of the classic languages and literature, and to philosophy. And now he turned his attention also to theology, of course in the old scholastic form in which theology was then taught, of the emptiness and uselessness of which he soon became convinced. He subsequently, at Wittenberg, obtained the title of doctor of theology; but he was never ordained to the ministry, preferring, like Calvin, to serve the Church merely in the capacity of a lay theologian. He never preached a sermon, but exerted his influence by means of his university lectures and his books.

In the year 1518, ten months after Luther had nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of the castle church at Wittenberg, Melancthon was called to a professorship in the university which had been established in that place in 1502, and which was destined soon to become, not merely a storm center, but a center of life and light for all Germany. At first he lectured on philosophy, but was soon transferred to the department of theology, where he powerfully supported the new reformatory doctrines preached by Luther. Luther and Melancthon, while in many respects direct antipodes, were at once drawn towards each other and entered into a friendship which, though at times somewhat strained, continued through life. In temperament, character and culture, the two men were wholly different. Luther was of an impulsive, passionate nature; Melancthon was mild and gentle. Luther was a man of the people, who had come up out of hard and difficult circumstances; Melancthon had never known the pressure of want. Luther had passed through severe mental and spiritual struggles, fighting frequently against sin and the devil until his physical strength was exhausted; Melancthon had experienced no such conflicts, but, like Zwingly, had gradually grown into the evangelical opinions which were then in the air.

Luther received his education in the heavy atmosphere of an Augustinian convent, praying, fasting, and brooding over the scholastic theology; Melancthon received his training in institutions of learning breathing the liberal spirit awakened by the *renaissance*. But the two men, while thus different, were complementary. They needed each other in order to their efficiency in the work to which Providence had called them. They were both engaged in the same great task of reforming the Church in faith and practice—the one, the man of action, furnishing the impulse and energy for the work; the other, the man of thought, furnishing the intellectual form and finish.

But there were differences, also, in their respective apprehensions of Christianity—differences resulting from their different mental constitutions and spiritual experiences—which have been reflected in the development of protestant theology, and church life in all subsequent times. In respect of the influence exerted by each of them, Luther was the more potent force during the time of the Reformation and the centuries immediately succeeding, while the power of Melancthon is more widely felt in our own time. The spirit of Melancthon is more akin to the spirit of this modern age than it was to that of the sixteenth century; and we are now prepared to do him the justice which his own age denied him. Perhaps he was too far in advance of his time to be rightly appreciated. The times in which he lived needed a rough, passionate, stormy leader, who was able to bear down all opposition by the force of his ponderous personality, and to scorn all suggestions of accommodation and compromise. Melancthon was a lover of peace and concord. He was an advocate of unity and harmony among the churches, even in spite of doctrinal and practical differences. For the sake of peace he was willing to make large concessions, and even sacrifices, if at least they did not touch the essentials of the faith. We remember, for instance, his relations to the Augsburg *Interim*, and the reproach which was heaped upon him afterwards in consequence of his having declared himself willing to accept certain Catholic ceremonies provided only the foundations of the Gospel were left.

Such a willingness to make concessions, and to agree to differ where unity of doctrine was impossible, was not in the spirit of that age; and perhaps it is well that it was not. It may have been necessary that the new Protestant faith should stiffen into something of a fixed form, and become fully conscious of its own contents and meaning, before it could afford to be liberal towards diverse apprehensions and formulations of doctrine. But things have changed now. There is less account made of precise theological formulas now than then. It is the spirit of Melancthon that rules the present age rather than the spirit of Luther; so that, for instance, it is harder now to justify Luther in withholding the hand of Christian fellowship from the Swiss at Marburg, than it was in his own time.

Melancthon saw correctly that Christianity is something different from dogmatic formulas or from speculative statements of doctrine. To the latter he was ever more or less averse on principle. In the earlier editions of his *Loci Communes*, the first dogmatic work of the Reformation, he passed over entirely such doctrines as those concerning the trinity, creation, and the incarnation, treating only of the more practical doctrines of sin, redemption, faith, justification and repentance. He justified this omission of the more speculative doctrines by saying that the mystery of divinity had better be adored than investigated, and that no investigation could even be attempted without great peril. But he was averse also to the exaggeration of the importance of dogmatic formulas, for the reason that they are at best only approximations to the Christian reality with which they have to do. That he appreciated the value of sound doctrine is shown by the fact that he was himself incessantly employed in reaching after it; but this continual effort also showed him how unreasonable it is to over-estimate the results reached at any particular time or by any particular individual. The theologian, like other men, sees only through a glass darkly, and the system which he builds up with such infinite labor and pain, is ever only an imperfect thing, and is ready to be laid upon the shelf about as soon as its author is laid in the grave. The-

ology is a progressive science, and no moment of time will ever be able to boast of having brought it to completion. If there could ever be an infallible creed or dogma, then the acceptance of that would be to the theologian the end of all questioning and thinking. But nothing was farther from the mind of Melancthon than any such conception of Christian truth. For him personally the apprehension of Christian truth was an ever progressive work. He was ever pressing forward toward a better understanding. Every one of the many editions of his *Loci Communes* presents new phases in the development of doctrine. He was never long satisfied with anything that he had written, but soon proceeded to make revisions and changes. Thus ten years after its first publication, he ventured to make changes even in the Augsburg Confession itself—a proceeding for which he has been often and severely criticised. How could he dare to introduce changes in the Confession, when it was no longer his own property, but had become the confession of the common faith of the Church? The fact is, however, that Melancthon never regarded it in that character. He never thought that the Confession was a finished and fixed formula of faith, beyond which there was no possibility of progress, and to the exact form of which all church members must be forever bound. He believed that the Confession was capable of improvement, like anything else he had written; and when any better form of thought or of expression occurred to him he did not hesitate to give it place.

But now, if theological science be thus in a state of continual flux, and if its results can never be anything more than inadequate expressions of Christian truth, what reason then is there why theological formulas should be made conditions of Church fellowship? Why should the mode of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper be a cause of division among Christians, so long as the fact is acknowledged? Melancthon was not always consistent in holding this broad view of the nature of Christian doctrine, and of its relation to the essence of Christian faith; else he could never have given his consent to the

execution of Servetus. But this was nevertheless the ideal that was hovering before his mind, and hence he was the prophet of Church union at a time when the tendency everywhere was towards a consolidation of the divided fragments of the Church about fragments of truth held in a one-sided and exaggerated form. Melancthon was of a more churchly temper than Luther, and hence felt more keenly the evils of division. But he also felt that the principle of union must be something other than intellectual apprehensions of dogmatic formulas. And that, we believe, is the position to which the mind of the Church is coming more and more in modern times. If the Church is ever to be one again, it must be united upon something else than creeds and theological systems. The unifying principle must be Christ and faith in Christ as the Revealer of God and Saviour of men. And in a re-united Church theology must be as free as the air. The truth which shall unite, must also make free.

There are in the teaching of Melancthon, particularly, two points of divergence from the teaching of Luther, in regard to which the theology of modern Protestantism generally goes with the former rather than with the latter. The first of these relates to the doctrine of predestination and of free will, the second to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The former made its appearance in time before the latter, but the latter first obtained symbolical recognition, for the reason probably that it was powerfully supported by the tendency of theological thought in the Protestant world outside of Germany. Melancthon gradually developed a doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, essentially differing from that of Luther. Whether this divergence was due to an immanent tendency in his own mind, or whether it was occasioned by his intercourse with foreign theologians, especially Bucer and Calvin, is a question that need not here detain us. The fact is that Melancthon gradually developed a doctrine substantially identical with that of Calvin, to which he gave expression in the *Variata* edition of the Augsburg Confession of the year 1540. The fact of such variation, and especially of the expression of it in this edition of the Confession, has sometimes

been denied, on the ground that no break occurred between Melancthon and Luther during the remaining six years of the latter's life. This proves, it has been said, that neither Luther nor Melancthon were conscious of any departure from the standard of Lutheran orthodoxy. But the fact is that the difference is there nevertheless. Luther taught that the body and blood of Christ are present in the *form* of bread and wine (therefore *locally*), and are *communicated* to those eating and drinking, and by all of them orally received. But in the *Variata* we read "that *with* bread and wine are truly *exhibited* the body and blood of Christ to those that eat in the Lord's Supper." It is the Calvinistic doctrine of a spiritual real presence of Christ in the sacrament rather than the Lutheran doctrine of a local presence of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine, and consequently of an oral manducation of the same, that is set forth in the *Variata*. That Luther and Melancthon did not fall out over this matter was, perhaps, because they could not afford to fall out. Their relations were, indeed, sometimes strained. Luther at times fretted and fumed about Melancthon's broad tendencies, and Melancthon sometimes grew tired of Luther's domineering spirit; but they continued to the end to treat each other as brothers in the Lord, because they had come to be mutually necessary to each other. And it may be too that neither of them was fully conscious of the whole bearing of their difference in this matter. After Luther's death, however, the difference was discovered by such spirits as Flacius, Hesshuss, Klebiz, Westphal, and others; and then the war was commenced which embittered the entire subsequent life of Melancthon and made him feel that death would be a desirable escape from the madness of the theologians, and which in the end drove the Palatinate, which had accepted the Reformation under Melancthonian influences, together with other large sections of German Protestantisms, formally over into the arms of the Reformed Church. That in modern times large sections of the Lutheran Church, especially in this country, and all bodies of Protestant Christians which are not Lutheran, have repudiated the old Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is a matter of history.

In regard to the other point of divergence from Lutheran teaching, namely, that relating to the doctrine of predestination and free will, the approval of the Protestant world has only come in more recent times, but it is now almost universal. In his first edition of the *Loci Communes*, Melancthon, like all the Reformers, accepted the exaggerated Augustinian doctrines of sin and grace. Luther adhered to these doctrines to the end of his life; and Calvin not only adhered to them, but elaborated them and fixed them in the heart of his doctrinal system. Melancthon, however, at first questioned, then doubted, and at last denied these doctrines in the form in which they had come down from Augustine. He was compelled to do this in the interest of an ethical apprehension of Christianity. Melancthon's mind was preëminently of an ethical cast. He studied Aristotle's ethics, and cultivated ethical thought with special fondness. But the Augustinian doctrine of total depravity is decidedly unethical. If the human soul has no more moral ability than a block or a stone, then where is its responsibility? And so, if human destiny is absolutely fixed by an eternal divine decree, without regard to human character or merit, what reality then can there belong to the moral life of men in this world? A life that accomplishes nothing but the actualization of a pre-determined result, can obviously have no moral value. And the doctrine of irresistible grace is equally unethical. A life in which the will is not free ceases to be a moral life. Hence Melancthon gradually rejected these doctrines, and assumed that in the conversion of the soul three causes coöperate, namely, the Divine Spirit, the Word of God, and the *human will*. The will is an active factor in the process of conversion, as well as in the process of sanctification. Salvation is an ethical process involving freedom, and not merely a physical or magical process accomplished by divine omnipotence. It is a process taking place in man through his will, which is a factor of faith itself, and not merely a decree concerning man. And good works are necessary, not as a ground of merit procuring salvation as a reward, but as the condition of developing a right Christian character, in which salvation essentially consists.

These views have at last gained ascendancy in modern theological thought. The unethical determinism of Calvin and of Luther, which was *not* eliminated in the Form of Concord, has at last been radically overcome in modern theology, and theological thought now is free to take on a thoroughly and consistently ethical character and form.

The German Reformed Church, which is the parent of the Reformed Church in the United States, owes its existence and character largely to the influence of Melancthon's teaching. As we have seen, the Palatinate, the original home of the Heidelberg Catechism, was at first Lutheran after the Melancthonian fashion; and it became Reformed only because Flacianism rather than Melancthonianism had become the predominant influence in the Lutheran Church of Germany. But in becoming Reformed it did not exchange its general religious character for the character of a foreign church. Even in accepting the Calvinistic doctrine of the sacrament the German leaders of the Palatinate did not accept any new and foreign teaching. Ursinus had learned the same doctrine from Melancthon, his personal friend and teacher at Wittenberg, before he had ever learned anything from Calvin. The Calvinistic doctrine of determinism was, indeed, accepted and taught by some German Reformed theologians, just as it was accepted also by some Lutheran theologians, but it never became the exclusive doctrine of the Church. The prevailing sentiment of the Church on this subject has always been Melancthonian rather than Calvinistic. Our Reformed Church is Calvinistic in its theory of Church government; it is Calvinistic and Melancthonian in its doctrine of the sacraments; and it is wholly Melancthonian in its doctrine of free grace, and in matters of cultus and church life generally. In general it has been the genius of Melancthon rather than the spirit of Calvin that has prevailed in our branch of the Reformed Church, giving it German geniality and depth rather than French formality and legalism.

SECURITY OF TRUST FUNDS.

It was reported, through *The Outlook*, several months ago, that action had been taken by the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in this State, looking to the "introduction of a bill into the legislature to empower the courts of the State to pass judgment on all alleged misuses of trust funds held by theological and similar institutions." The design of the legislation to be asked for was to give power "to the courts to decide whether, in case charges of teaching heresy are made, such teachings constitute a misuse of funds;" and the object plainly aimed at was to get out of the way obnoxious teachers who could not be removed by the machinery of ecclesiastical and civil law now existing. We have not since then heard or seen anything of this movement, although we have been watching for it. Nor do we know whether the legislation to be asked for was or is intended to apply only to the Presbyterian Church, or whether it is intended to affect all churches alike. But in any case, the subject is one of sufficient importance to justify us in giving it some consideration.

We presume that there will be general agreement as to the proposition that trust funds should be sacredly administered in agreement with the intention and purpose of their creation. Money given for a particular purpose, whether it be the building of a church, the establishment of a hospital, the foundation of a library, or the endowment of a theological seminary, should be applied as nearly as possible to the purpose for which it was given. The alienation of such gifts of money, or of the property in which they are invested, to objects entirely different from those intended by the givers, is generally immoral, and should be carefully guarded against by judicious legislation. For example, a church built with the money of a particular denomination, and for its use, should remain the property of that denomination; and legislation should be so framed as to make the alienation of such property impossible, except where the fulfillment of its original destination may demand it. We know of some valuable

church properties which once belonged to the Reformed Church, and which are now in the possession of other denominations; and for us at least it is difficult to see by what code of morals these denominations can justify such possession.

But while we can see the propriety of any reasonable measures to prevent abuses of trust funds, yet we question whether it is not going a little bit too far if, in order to secure this end, we are willing to give to the civil courts power to determine questions of religious doctrine. We should be afraid, for instance, that courts might either not be sufficiently informed, or that they might not be sufficiently impartial to reach just conclusions on such questions. It is firmly believed by some good people that in a certain famous church case in Philadelphia, a good many years ago, the decision of the court was swayed by the Calvinistic bias of one of the judges. Now, we should be afraid that if questions of orthodoxy or heterodoxy were to be submitted to the courts, the decisions would often be swayed by such influences. And we should be afraid, too, that such power might be abused by ill-disposed people to keep the teachers of the Church, whether in professorial chairs or in the pulpit, in continual anxiety and alarm, to the great detriment of the Church. What would be the standard of orthodoxy according to which the courts would be expected to judge? The Confessions, of course, in their strictest and most literal interpretation. But the Confessions are not infallible; and there are few ministers in any of the churches who are willing to swear to everything that is taught in their Confessions. How, for example, would the Presbyterians like to be held to every detail of doctrine contained in the Confession of Westminster? That Confession teaches that the world was made in six days, and that there are non-elect infants in hell. How would Presbyterian ministers now like to preach those doctrines? And yet if they did not preach them, or at least confess them, any contentious member of the Church might prefer charges of heresy against any pastor, and manage to have the case brought to the civil court, where, on a strict construction of the Confession, he would be declared a heretic,

having no right to be supported by the funds of the Church; for in a civil court no such pretenses would be accepted as that the word "day" in the Confession might mean an indefinite period of time, as has been supposed to be the case in Genesis. We think that a power which might be thus used would be a rather dangerous power to entrust to the courts of the State.

But we would question the wisdom of such legislation for another and more fundamental reason, namely, the reason that the confessional standards of a denomination cannot have absolutely binding authority for its members during all time. Confessions are not absolute and final formulations of Christian truth. They represent the commonly received faith of a denomination at the time when they were formed. But time passes, and there come changes; new questions and new issues arise; theological science makes progress, and old formulations of truth are found to be no longer adequate. What are the teachers of the Church to do in these circumstances? Must they go out of the Church, or, failing to do that, must they be thrust out, so soon as their teaching no longer squares at all points with the teaching of the Confession or with the traditional dogmatic system? This view has been maintained by some theological writers, whom, as we think, partisan zeal, and not love of truth, has blinded. We think, too, of course, that any teacher should be in harmony with the spirit of the Church in whose service he is employed. A Methodist, for instance, has no business in a Reformed pulpit or institution of learning. He can be better employed in the Methodist Church. But this is something different from demanding acceptance of all the confessional doctrines of a denomination in order to secure employment in her service as a teacher. Think, for instance, of requiring of all Reformed ministers that they should accept the answer to the 46th question of the Heidelberg Catechism as being a correct explanation of the article of the Creed to which it refers. Such a policy would lead either to hypocrisy of the most infamous kind, or to the stagnation and death of all theological thought.

Is it, then, an abuse of trust funds if a teacher of theology

entertains and teaches theological opinions which are somewhat different from those entertained by the founders of such funds? How can it be known that if those founders were living now, and had passed through the development of theological science which has taken place since their day, they would not entertain the same opinions which the most advanced scholars of the Church entertain now? But even suppose it were otherwise; have those founders a right, by means of their gifts, to fasten their opinions upon the Church for all time? May the dead thus forever enslave the mind of the living? As long as a man lives, he may have the right to do with his money what he wills, and to give it for the support of any opinions he pleases. But does this right also endure into an indefinite future after the man is dead? Must the money which has been set apart by the devout Catholic for the purpose of saying masses for the dead be forever used for that purpose, in spite of any change which may come over the opinion of the Church in regard to that subject? That trust funds should be held for the benefit of the general cause for which they were intended by their founders, is generally recognized, and the courts have always so ruled. For instance, funds contributed to a Presbyterian school of theology are intended for the education of ministers for the Presbyterian Church, and must be so used as long as the Presbyterian Church exists. But does this imply that the teachers in such a school must always be bound in all respects to the known opinions of the founders of the school, or even of the framers of the Confession? Would that be good policy? Would it not give to the "dead hand" an influence over the affairs of the living that would soon become intolerable?

This question came up in the time of the Reformation and in the century following; and, as Schiller has observed, it was one of the causes which led to the Thirty Years' War. The Protestants had taken possession of Church property which had been created by Catholics for the benefit of the Catholic Church. In many cases also Catholics and Protestants contended for the same property. The Catholics argued, "This property was es-

tablished by Catholic men and women, with Catholic money, and therefore it belongs to us." The Protestants replied, "The founders of this property were our fathers and mothers. They established this foundation for the spiritual benefit of themselves and their children, and not for the perpetuation or promotion of a set of theological opinions. Hence the property is ours by right of inheritance." To us it seems that the claim of the Protestants was a righteous claim and should have been so recognized. Schiller, however, intimates that the question was one that could not be settled by law, but only by the sword. "The law," he says, "has decisions only for conceivable cases; and, perhaps, spiritual foundations do not belong to this class of cases; at least they do not belong to them when the aims of their founders are made to extend to dogmatic propositions; for how is it possible to make an eternal donation to a changeable opinion?" The authors of those spiritual foundations had no idea of the possibility of two such opposite systems of Christianity as Roman Catholicism and Protestantism ever contending with each other in the same territory; and how, then, could they be supposed to have intended their foundation for the benefit of the one system rather than for the benefit of the other? But the arbitrament of the sword decided the question at last in favor of the Protestants, and Protestant congregations continued to worship in churches built with the money of their Catholic ancestors. And we think that it is bad policy for Protestants now to deny the *principle* involved in that decision.

But we have a more weighty authority even than this: it is the example of St. Paul preaching the Gospel of Christ in Jewish synagogues, and the example of Christ himself preaching in the Temple at Jerusalem. Paul "reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks," we read in Acts 18: 14. And he did this not only in one place, but wherever he went and found synagogues, he availed himself of the opportunity which they afforded of preaching Christ. What right had he to do this if the principle be correct that spiritual foundations must always be used strictly for the promotion of

the opinions of those who established them? These synagogues had been erected by Jewish piety, with Jewish money, for the purpose of maintaining the Jewish faith. Yet Paul freely entered into these institutions and preached a faith that was subversive of Judaism. His birth and Jewish nationality enabled him to do this; but had he a moral right to do it? Not if the arguments of some of the extreme zealots who have discussed the question within the last few years were correct. We dare say, however, that the question never occurred to Paul at all. But it may be argued that in using the synagogue for the purpose of preaching the Gospel, he only acted in harmony with the ultimate purpose of all Jewish institutions, which purpose was to lead to Christ. The Jewish faith was not a finality. It was to be transcended when the fulness of the time had come. Its fundamental principle, namely, faith in Jehovah and in His promises was to be preserved, but the shell of Judaism was to be abolished. And it was, therefore, no immoral act for the Apostle to use Jewish agencies and Jewish means in order to lead the Jewish people to serve the God of their fathers after the *way* which they called *heresy*.

This argument is no doubt correct. And this argument will also justify the appropriation of Catholic foundations by Protestant Christians in the time of the Reformation. Roman Catholic Christianity was a preparation for Protestant Christianity. But this is the relation also of one stage of development of theological thought to another in a Christian denomination. There is always a relation of continuity, and the lower stage ever looks to the higher. Presbyterianism, for instance, is not a finality for Christian faith, and the Westminster Confession is not a finality for Presbyterianism. And consequently it is not an abuse of the institutions created by one period if they are used for the propagation of the opinions of a succeeding period, provided the latter aim at the same end as the former. Scientific institutions are bound thus to undergo continual changes. Think of a medical school being forever bound by the terms of its foundation to teach only the medical theories held by its found-

ers! Shall theological institutions alone be put into fetters, and not be allowed to make any progress? What, then, will become of theology and of the Church? For the sake of the future prosperity of the Presbyterian Church we sincerely hope that our Presbyterian brethren will not commit the mistake of putting it into the power of the civil courts to arrest all progress of thought in their theological schools.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

ANCIENT INDIA; Its Language and Religions. By Prof. W. Oldenberg. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ills., 1896. Pages, 110. Price 25 cents, paper binding.

This little work consists of three essays, which were first published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* of Berlin. The translation was made by competent persons, and reads smoothly. The volume is provided also, like all the publications of this company, with a full index, which adds much to its value. The subjects of these essays respectfully are "The Study of Sanscrit," "The Religion of the Veda," and "Buddhism." In the first of these essays we have an interesting account of the progress of Sanscrit scholarship during the present century, and of the relations of the ancient language of the Indian Aryans. In the second essay, the religion of the Veda is discussed. The Veda (or Vedas, for there are four books) contains probably the most ancient religious literature in the world. It consists of a collection of hymns and prayers addressed to the gods; and these gods are the half humanized personifications of the powers of nature, corresponding in point of development to the mythological conceptions of the ancient Germans, as we learn to know them from the Edda. In the last essay the author draws out several interesting parallels between the religious thought of India and of Greece. One of these is the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, which seems to have originated simultaneously in Greece and in India. Certain likenesses between the teaching of Buddhism and of Christianity have frequently been observed, and some writers have supposed that the latter religion must have borrowed from the former. Prof. Oldenberg is of the contrary opinion, and maintains that the similarity of effects is due to a similarity of causes. In conclusion we can only say that any production by so competent an author as Prof. Oldenberg, on so fascinating a subject as India, could not well fail to be interesting.

THE CURE OF SOULS: Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, at Yale University. 1896. By John Watson, M. A., D. D. Pages, 301. Price, \$1.50. Dodd, Mead & Company, publishers, New York.

The nine lectures of which this work consists have respectively the following headings: "The Genesis of a Sermon," "The Technique of a Sermon," "Problems of Preaching," "Theology the Theory of Religion," "The New Dogma," "The Machinery of a Congregation," "The Work of a Pastor," "The

Public Worship of God," "The Minister's Care of Himself." It will be seen that this outline of subjects touches upon nearly the whole field of practical theology, although the theme to which the most attention is devoted is, of course, preaching, which is the most weighty and the most difficult of the minister's functions. The preacher, however, is not merely an orator, nor merely a teacher, but a trainer of souls—one by whose care souls are to be made to grow into their proper divine image. Hence the title of the book, *The Cure of Souls*.

Dr. Watson's idea of a sermon is the idea of a growth rather than of a manufacture. In order to kindle life in an audience the sermon must itself be a living thing. "A sermon," he says, page 11, "is more than a cunning creation; it is an inspiration, not so much dead stuff laboriously fitted together, but a tree whose leaf is green, which yieldeth its fruit in due season." Here is the secret of the failure of a great many sermons. A sermon may contain any amount of sound doctrine and much learning, but if it be not *vitalized by the breath of life* it will accomplish nothing. The formal qualities of a good sermon the author declares to be *unity, lucidity, beauty, humanity, delivery, intensity*. By *delivery* he means *speaking*, not *reading*; although he insists on the careful preparation of sermons, even to the extent of writing them, and says that "extempore" sermons had better be called "extrumperty" sermons.

The lectures on the problems of preaching and on the new dogma are among the most interesting in the course. Among the problems of preaching is the question how the preacher ought to relate himself to the interests of secular life. Should preaching be confined entirely to matters of the other world—what is sometimes called the "simple gospel"—or should it deal with men's moral life in this world? Dr. Watson, while recognizing the fact that the Gospel has to do mainly with things of the other world, nevertheless does not forget that godliness is profitable for the world which now is. In the lecture on the "new dogma" the author maintains that theological science has developed, "not along a straight line, but in a course of progressive and sometimes intersecting circles." These are *mysticism, dogmatism* and *criticism*. The first of these is illustrated, according to Dr. Watson, in the Apostolic and the first part of the Ante-Nicene period, when Christianity is simply a direct apprehension of Christ and a life in Christ by faith. The second is the period of scholasticism, beginning with the Nicene age, when Christianity is employed with the formation of dogma. And this is succeeded by the period of criticism, when dogmas are dissolved and doctrines are again brought into a state of flux, in order once more to solidify into new dogma. The first is the age of St. John, the second the age of the schoolmen, the third

the age of Erasmus. But these circles of development succeed each other in ceaseless movement, which is always upward towards a better apprehension of Christianity. This last position, we think, must be regarded as correct, whatever may be thought of the author's idea of the process of religious thought. The author is persuaded that we are at present standing at the close of a critical period, and that the characteristic of the immediate future of religious thought will be mysticism, enriched by the results of past criticism. In speaking of the cry of "back to Christ," now so frequently heard, Dr. Watson discourses as follows: "When a minister leads his people in the return to Christ, it is well for him to avoid two extremes. He must neither go to the Gospels alone, for there he is dealing with an earthly Christ, nor to the heavens alone, for there he is dealing with an unknown Christ, but to Him who is alive forevermore, and whom we have in the Gospels. Criticism gives us the historical Christ, and mysticism gives us the spiritual Christ, and both united give us the real Christ."

Dr. Watson himself, we should say constitutionally is neither a critic nor a dogmatist, but a mystic and a poet, though of a very sane and sober order. Some of his former works have been criticised for what has been called "looseness of thought." To the dogmatist his logic may sometimes appear to be faulty. He has even been accused of incorrect quotations from the Scriptures. We presume that he cares but little for such criticism. The same charges could be brought against St. Paul, whose emotion sometimes caused him to forget his grammar. Critics of this class Dr. Watson himself would probably call "wooden thinkers," as he speaks of a certain theology as "wooden theology," and he would have little patience with them. He himself is a preacher who thinks thoughts that live, and that could not, without squeezing the life out of them, be forced into the moulds of a formal logic. This is the secret of Dr. Watson's success. It is the secret of the attractiveness of the book under notice. It is a book which one reads with pleasure; and which, once having taken up, one is loath to lay down. And the thought expressed *forces* itself upon the reader, and sticks to him whether he will or not. That is the kind of writing and speaking which kindles not only thought but life in the reader and hearer. To the Ministry a book like this must prove to be of immense value. If there is any brother who feels his power waning and sees his congregation going down, we advise him to read this book on "the cure of souls," and we believe that it will put new life both into himself and into his church. In fact we do not see how a minister could read what is here said on the duty of study, on the preparation of sermons, on pastoral visitation, on the conduct of worship, on the

organization and management of a church, and on the care of himself, without being inspired with loftier ideals of the functions of his office and quickened with new life and power for the performance of these functions.

GOD'S PLAN OF SALVATION, An Honest Inquiry into the Condition of the Soul after Death. By Rev. D. F. Brendle, D.D., author of the "Prodigal Son," "The Lives and Labors of the Apostles," etc. Berkemyer, Keck & Co., Printers, Allentown, Pa. 1896. Pages, 304.

This work is well printed. Paper and typography are all that the eye could desire. The reading of it, therefore, involves no physical burden, which is a valuable quality in any book intended to circulate among the people generally. A good portrait of the venerable author faces the title page, which will doubtless enhance the value of the work to his intimate friends, and especially to his parishioners whom he has served faithfully and well during so many years.

The work consists of twelve chapters, whose respective titles are as follows: "The Fall and its Import," "The Covenant of Works," "The Covenant of Grace," "The Incarnation," "The Human Character of Christ," "The Crucifixion of Christ," "Christ's Descent into Hades," "Death and Resurrection," "The Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ," "The Future Life," "The Angels," "The Fallen Angels." From this table of subjects it will be seen that the scope of the book embraces some of the most interesting topics in theology, concerning which there has been no little difference of opinion among theologians in the past.

The book is orthodox, and Scriptural as the author understands Scripture. It bears evidence throughout that the author's mind has not been distracted by any contentions of modern science or criticism. Not that he is ignorant of these contentions. He has heard about them, and has probably investigated their claims. But they have made no impression upon his mind, and have not at all affected his thinking. With the theory of *evolution*, for instance, the author of the book before us has no patience at all. On page 17, he says: "It is impossible for one who has adopted the evolution theory to be a Christian. For a Christian is one who believes in Christ. And Christ was not only man, but God. He was the God-man. He did not come into existence by the process of evolution; not by the descent from a lower species—a monkey. The disciples of Darwin do not believe that men have souls, or that they were in need of salvation, which Christ came to bring into the world. If men and women are nothing but monkeys fully developed, they must be atheists who argue thus."

That may do as a specimen of the author's style both of writ-

ing and thinking. How literally he holds to the good old tradition in regard to matters now much disputed may be inferred from the very first sentence of the book under notice: "In the beginning of time, nearly six thousand years ago, God created the heavens and the earth with all that they contain." We observe, however, that the author is not quite consistent with himself, when he allows, on page 51, that death was in the world previous to the fall of man. "Death," he says, "was no doubt in the world and reigned over animated nature before the fall, as we learn from geological researches, and Adam would no doubt have been translated to a higher state of glory if he had not sinned." How long could death have been in the world, and how many geological strata could have been formed previous to the fall, if the world was created in six days not quite six thousand years ago? That will hardly do. If the first chapter of Genesis is to be taken for literal history, the science of geology will have to be bowed off the stage of knowledge.

In regard to the death of Christ, which our author contends did *not* take place on a *Friday* according to the received tradition, but on a *Thursday*, he holds the usual legal theory of the atonement; maintaining, however, contrary to the doctrine of many, that Christ "suffered two deaths; one being His physical death on Calvary, and the other the spiritual death He endured in Hades." Christ as our substitute must have suffered not only physical but also spiritual death in our behalf. Hence His descent into Hades had for its end not merely to preach unto the spirits in prison, but to suffer there the torments of the damned. Christ thus paid the full penalty of sin. Why then are not all men saved? Dr. Brendle has the usual answer: "The active and passive obedience of Christ must in some real and living way be imputed to His people," he says. But why must it? When the debt is paid, the penalty of all the sins of all men endured, how can the justice of God require anything more? We think these questions show that the doctrine of the atonement must be wrought out on another line than that of legalism.

We are glad to see that our author holds the doctrine of "the larger hope" in regard to the salvation of the heathen. "If there is no grace in the intermediate state for some," he says, "we do not see how any hope can be entertained with reference to unbaptized infants, idiots, and heathen, unregenerated as they are, who never had the Gospel preached to them, and stood in no living union with Christ before their death. To condemn them in a wholesale way would be unmerciful and unjust, and no one could reconcile the justice of God in saving some and letting others go to destruction without any fault of theirs," p. 167. On this subject the author is in line with "the new

theology," nor should this be surprising in a man of his intelligence.

We welcome this book into the republic of letters as an earnest effort on the part of a laborious pastor to solve for himself some of the difficult questions in theology. Work of this kind is a useful exercise for any minister of the Gospel. It will serve to keep his mind keen and fresh; and his preaching and pastoral work will be the more effective for such literary exercises. Besides, no man really knows theology until he has thought out its various problems for himself; and the way to do that, for many men at least, is to write treatises. And such efforts should, therefore, be encouraged by the Church and her members. Books written by Reformed ministers are not numerous; and the few that have been written ought to be in the libraries of our Reformed people. We hope, then, that Dr. Brendle's book may meet with an extensive sale.

MARTIN LUTHER. By Gustav Freytag. Translated by Henry E. O. Heine-mann. Pages, 127. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill., 1897.

This book is not intended for the professional theologian, but for intelligent readers in general. It is not a biography in the ordinary sense; but it is a picture of the man who was the leading agent in the Reformation of the 16th century. As such it is successful in a high degree. It places its subject before the mind of the reader so vividly that the latter cannot fail to obtain a clear conception of it. The colossal personality of the man, his relation to his age and environment, his virtues and his faults are so vividly portrayed, that the reader will rise from the perusal of the volume with a better idea of Luther, the man of God, than he possessed before.

Luther was the impersonation of his age and of his people. He and his coadjutors were but the instruments created by Providence through which old abuses were to be abolished and the progress of the Church into a new stage of development accomplished. When at the Diet of Worms he refused to recant with the exclamation, "I can not do otherwise; may God help me," that was the literal truth. Luther was not a wilful, capricious man who merely acted a part which he had chosen from ambition or vanity. He became a reformer, not because he wanted to be one, but because he could not do otherwise. He was the representative of the German mind and life, and was impelled forward with a force that was irresistible. Consequently all sections of Christendom are interested in his life and work. Even the Catholic Church is better now than it would have been without Luther and his co-laborers.

This is the view in which Luther is presented in the book

before us. Indeed, in this book Luther is not a *Lutheran*, but a Protestant Christian with universal tendencies and affinities, which, however, did not always come to their rights. For instance, according to the view of the author, Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper was defective, and his literal interpretation of the words of institution was a mistake. This shows his limitation. Such limitations in the character of his hero our author does not seek to conceal—a fact which makes his work all the more interesting, especially to persons who are not members of the Lutheran Church. To Sunday schools and to intelligent Christians of all denominations, accordingly, this new portrait of Luther ought to be welcome.

THE CELESTIAL SUMMONS. By Rev. Angelo Carroll. Edited by Homer Eaton, D.D. Publishers, Eaton and Mains, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1896. Pages, 280. Price, \$1.25.

This is a volume of sermons named after the first one in the series. The sermons are twelve in number, bearing the following titles respectively: "The Celestial Summons;" "Christ the World-Leader;" "Nature's Interpretation of Immortality;" "The Land of Uprightness;" "The Star of Bethlehem;" "Watching with Christ One Hour;" "Christianity a Spiritual Warfare;" "The Great Plaudit;" "Christ's Sovereignty over the Human Heart;" "The Ethical and the Æsthetical in Christianity;" "A Religion for All Time;" "The Millennial Call."

Mr. Carroll, the author of these sermons, was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who labored at first in New England and later on the Pacific Coast. He is said to have been a preacher of exceptional mental power, as well as of religious fervor and eloquence. From the titles of the different sermons in the collection it will be observed that they cover a variety of interesting topics; and these are treated in an interesting way. The sermons on "Christ the World-Leader;" on "Nature's Interpretation of Immortality;" and on the "Ethical and Æsthetical in Christianity," are particularly worthy of mention. In the second of these sermons the author shows that nature points to the immortality of the soul no less distinctly than the Bible, and that the two revelations, the natural and the supernatural, are not contradictory. From the third, which is the tenth in the series, we shall quote a few sentences as specimens of the author's style and spirit. "Religion is the living action of God's presence in men, breathing forth its divine spirit through all the turmoil and darkness of the world." "There is a man in the road distressed and dying. He has fallen into bad hands. Now I may come along, the best and most zealous of Pharisees, meditating profoundly on the law of

theology," nor should this be surprising in a man of his intelligence.

We welcome this book into the republic of letters as an earnest effort on the part of a laborious pastor to solve for himself some of the difficult questions in theology. Work of this kind is a useful exercise for any minister of the Gospel. It will serve to keep his mind keen and fresh; and his preaching and pastoral work will be the more effective for such literary exercises. Besides, no man really knows theology until he has thought out its various problems for himself; and the way to do that, for many men at least, is to write treatises. And such efforts should, therefore, be encouraged by the Church and her members. Books written by Reformed ministers are not numerous; and the few that have been written ought to be in the libraries of our Reformed people. We hope, then, that Dr. Brendle's book may meet with an extensive sale.

MARTIN LUTHER. By Gustav Freytag. Translated by Henry E. O. Heine-mann. Pages, 127. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill., 1897.

This book is not intended for the professional theologian, but for intelligent readers in general. It is not a biography in the ordinary sense; but it is a picture of the man who was the leading agent in the Reformation of the 16th century. As such it is successful in a high degree. It places its subject before the mind of the reader so vividly that the latter cannot fail to obtain a clear conception of it. The colossal personality of the man, his relation to his age and environment, his virtues and his faults are so vividly portrayed, that the reader will rise from the perusal of the volume with a better idea of Luther, the man of God, than he possessed before.

Luther was the impersonation of his age and of his people. He and his coadjutors were but the instruments created by Providence through which old abuses were to be abolished and the progress of the Church into a new stage of development accomplished. When at the Diet of Worms he refused to recant with the exclamation, "I can not do otherwise; may God help me," that was the literal truth. Luther was not a wilful, capricious man who merely acted a part which he had chosen from ambition or vanity. He became a reformer, not because he wanted to be one, but because he could not do otherwise. He was the representative of the German mind and life, and was impelled forward with a force that was irresistible. Consequently all sections of Christendom are interested in his life and work. Even the Catholic Church is better now than it would have been without Luther and his co-laborers.

This is the view in which Luther is presented in the book

before us. Indeed, in this book Luther is not a *Lutheran*, but a Protestant Christian with universal tendencies and affinities, which, however, did not always come to their rights. For instance, according to the view of the author, Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper was defective, and his literal interpretation of the words of institution was a mistake. This shows his limitation. Such limitations in the character of his hero our author does not seek to conceal—a fact which makes his work all the more interesting, especially to persons who are not members of the Lutheran Church. To Sunday schools and to intelligent Christians of all denominations, accordingly, this new portrait of Luther ought to be welcome.

THE CELESTIAL SUMMONS. By Rev. Angelo Carroll. Edited by Homer Eaton, D.D. Publishers, Eaton and Mains, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1896. Pages, 280. Price, \$1.25.

This is a volume of sermons named after the first one in the series. The sermons are twelve in number, bearing the following titles respectively: "The Celestial Summons;" "Christ the World-Leader;" "Nature's Interpretation of Immortality;" "The Land of Uprightness;" "The Star of Bethlehem;" "Watching with Christ One Hour;" "Christianity a Spiritual Warfare;" "The Great Plaudit;" "Christ's Sovereignty over the Human Heart;" "The Ethical and the Æsthetical in Christianity;" "A Religion for All Time;" "The Millennial Call."

Mr. Carroll, the author of these sermons, was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who labored at first in New England and later on the Pacific Coast. He is said to have been a preacher of exceptional mental power, as well as of religious fervor and eloquence. From the titles of the different sermons in the collection it will be observed that they cover a variety of interesting topics; and these are treated in an interesting way. The sermons on "Christ the World-Leader;" on "Nature's Interpretation of Immortality;" and on the "Ethical and Æsthetical in Christianity," are particularly worthy of mention. In the second of these sermons the author shows that nature points to the immortality of the soul no less distinctly than the Bible, and that the two revelations, the natural and the supernatural, are not contradictory. From the third, which is the tenth in the series, we shall quote a few sentences as specimens of the author's style and spirit. "Religion is the living action of God's presence in men, breathing forth its divine spirit through all the turmoil and darkness of the world." "There is a man in the road distressed and dying. He has fallen into bad hands. Now I may come along, the best and most zealous of Pharisees, meditating profoundly on the law of

God on my way to offer sacrifice at the altar. But if I leave it to that half-heathen Samaritan to get down from off his beast and pick that man up and carry him into the inn and have him cared for and pay the expense himself, I may depend on it that the Lord Jesus Christ will endorse the Samaritan's orthodoxy before he will endorse mine."

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By Alfred Weber, Professor in the University of Strasburg. Authorized Translation. By Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri. From the Fifth French Edition, New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. Price, \$2.50.

For purposes of instruction this is without doubt the best history of philosophy in the English language. The arrangement of the subject seems to be perfect. The indispensable facts are expressed in simple, clear-cut statements, which any person of ordinary understanding and culture can comprehend, and in a style which renders them easy to retain in memory. The History of Philosophy, if true to its claim, must grapple with many difficult problems, such as have taxed the powers of the acutest intellects in all ages. But, philosophy to be of any real value must give its deliverances in conceptions, expressed by language, which can be understood. Otherwise it fails of its purpose, and becomes obnoxious to the common reproach that it deals with, a subject which befalls alike its masters and their scholars. Weber is an author who gives us the pleasure that always attends those *who have something to say*; who understand themselves and can make others see what they see.

A History of Philosophy to be complete would embrace a statement and criticism of the general principles which underlie all positive science as well as speculation. Hence a manual must make a selection of the vital points, and the author's skill will be shown both in the material selected and that omitted. While the time given to class study of philosophy in our universities and colleges is limited, and only an outline can be taught to the great body of students; still there will be, in every class, some inquiring minds who will not be satisfied with this meagre outline. These wish to pursue the subject farther, and need a guide to their inquiries. They wish to know the sources which are authorities for further investigation; they desire the latest editions of the best works in the entire field of inquiry. In this respect Weber and his translator are especially valuable. The bibliography of the subject, the references to the only latest sources of information, are a marked feature of this work. For anything the advanced student requires for an unlimited prosecution of the researches is here presented in a condensed form, which saves a painful search in our endless list of works on the subject of philosophy; and presents at

a glance the very information he ought to possess. Meanwhile the skillful arrangement of the leading points at the top of the page in large, clear type, and the farther elucidation and references to yet more complete information in foot notes, render this manual exactly suited to the purpose of instruction; while it provokes any but the dullest and most indifferent to continue their studies. The author most happily combines the thoroughness of the German specialist with the clearness which characterizes the French mind and language. The translator has done his work well. The style is simple and vigorous; free from those obscurities which are prone to creep in through the endeavor of a translator to be fair to the original while faithful to his own idiom.

No better book could be desired in our present stage of progress in the teaching of philosophy. It must supercede the larger works, such as Ueberweg and Wurdleband, which, from their size, are unsuited to class rooms, and the smaller one of Schwegler, which, though exceedingly able, is written in a style too difficult for the ordinary student, and is destitute of those helps in the way of notes and bibliography which render Weber so valuable. And not the least noteworthy are the references to Americans and those, who, by their work in the last thirty years, have won for themselves an honored place among the world's workers in the domain of philosophy and logic.

JACOB COOPER.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY: an Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity, According to the New Testament Sources. By Dr. Willibald Beyschlag, Professor of Theology at Halle. Translated by Rev. Neil Buchanan. In two volumes. Pages, 442+532. Price, \$6.00 per set. F. and F. Clark, Edinburg, and Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1895.

Biblical Theology is comparatively a new theological science. It has only been cultivated seriously since the beginning of the present century, and has become entirely emancipated from dogmatics only within the past twenty-five years. What was meant by Biblical theology at an earlier time was only the dogmatics of a denomination or the theological system of an individual fortified by proof passages from the Bible. A work on theology was believed to be Biblical when its various propositions were supported by like-sounding texts taken indiscriminately from any part of Scripture. What is understood by Biblical theology now, is the theology of the different books of the Bible treated each as a separate and independent whole. It is only in this way that the meaning and intention of the writers of the Sacred Scriptures can be ascertained. It can easily be seen that for Protestantism Biblical theology, in this sense, must be of the utmost importance. It may be expected too,

that, within Protestantism, much of the theology that has come down from the past, will in the future be revolutionized by the influence of Biblical theology. The Church will first learn more thoroughly what the Bible teaches, and then revise her dogmatics accordingly.

This work of Dr. Beyschlag's is a treatise on Biblical theology in the sense indicated above. Its general character and style are calculated to secure for it wide reading and study. We have been accustomed heretofore to expect a translation of a German theological work of this kind to be dull and heavy, and only intelligible to one who could translate the English sentences back again into German. The work before us presents a delightful exception to this rule. Prof. Beyschlag's German style is clear, direct, and perspicuous. There is about it none of the involution and haziness which characterized so much of the writing of the earlier mediation school. And his translator, Mr. Buchanan, who is himself a theologian, has caught the sense of his author, and rendered it into clear and elegant English.

Professor Beyschlag, who, by the way, is one of the editors of the *Studien und Kritiken*, which circumstance is an evidence of his high standing as a theologian in Germany, occupies something of an intermediate position between the old mediation school and the modern school of Ritschl. He has given up many of the positions of the mediation theologians; and he does not wholly go with the Ritschl school. In his criticism of the sources he is more conservative than many others; while in his interpretation he is very free, refusing entirely to be bound by any past traditions. What does the Bible teach? is his only question. He has no concern as to whether the result shall agree or not with what the Church has been teaching. We have no hesitation in saying that to us many of his constructions of New Testament teaching appear to be incomparably more reasonable than the traditional dogmas to which they are opposed. As an illustration, we would refer to his construction of the doctrine of the atonement. On some points, however, we are bound to dissent. We could, for example, not accept his Christology in the form in which it is presented. That he has finally overthrown the *Kenotic* theory, if it still needed any overthrowing, we are ready to admit. But we are not prepared to admit that the preëxistence of the Logos was only the preëxistence of a personified idea. We think that the teaching of the New Testament involves a deeper truth than that. But it is not our purpose to criticise the work under notice, but merely to call attention to it. The American theologian may find in it much that is strange, and much that he may not be able to accept.